NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

DEBATES

ON THE

Revision of the Prayer Book and the Psalter.

HOUSE OF BISHOPS.

(*Monday and Tuesday, April* 16 *and* 17, 1923.)

BX
5018
B52
1923
GTU
Storage

LONDON:
NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,
CHURCH HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W. 1
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C. 2.

Price 1s. net.

PACIFIC UNITARIAN SCHOOL FOR THE MINISTRY
NON MINISTRARI SED MINISTRARE
INCORPORATED
MAY 12, 1906

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

THE GIFT OF

J. C. Perkins

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

DEBATES

ON THE

Revision of the Prayer Book and the Psalter.

HOUSE OF BISHOPS

(*Monday and Tuesday, April* 16 *and* 17, 1923.)

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY

LONDON:
NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,
CHURCH HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W. 1;
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE,
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C. 2.

CONTENTS.

Revised Prayer Book (Permissive Use) Measure, 1923.

	PAGES.	PAGES.
GENERAL APPROVAL		1 — 79
The Chairman	1, 76	
Bishop of Durham	23	
„ „ Chelmsford	65	
„ „ Chichester	10, 75	
„ „ Ely	42	
„ „ Exeter	74	
„ „ Liverpool	57	
„ „ Manchester	51	
„ „ Norwich	47	
„ „ Ripon	29	
„ „ S. Albans	60	
„ „ Truro	19	
„ „ Winchester	70	
Archbishop of York	35	

Revised Psalter (Permissive Use) Measure, 1923.

	PAGES.	PAGES.
GENERAL APPROVAL		80 — 85
The Chairman	85	
Bishop of Chester	84	
„ „ Ely	80	

264.16
C65rd

National Assembly of the Church of England.

DEBATES

ON

The Revision of the Prayer Book and the Psalter.

HOUSE OF BISHOPS.

(*Monday and Tuesday, April* 16 *and* 17, 1923.)

Revised Prayer Book (Permissive Use) Measure, 1923.

A separate session of the House of Bishops was held in the Hoare Memorial Hall, Church House, Westminster, on Monday, April 16, at 3 p.m., his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury being in the chair.

The following were present during the session: The Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Bishops of Durham, Winchester, Bradford, Bristol, Carlisle, Chelmsford, Chester, Chichester, Coventry, Ely, Exeter, Hereford, Lichfield, Lincoln, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle, Norwich, Peterborough, Ripon, Rochester, S. Albans, S. Edmundsbury and Ipswich, Sheffield, Truro, Wakefield, and Worcester.

THE CHAIRMAN *opened the proceedings with prayer.*

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a formal meeting of the House of Bishops, and it should be understood that it is as such that we are deliberating. It is to the bishops that I have to speak.

The meeting is an important occasion in the modern history of the Church of England. Not merely are we engaged in a very solemn task in considering how our prayers are to be so arranged, ordered, and attuned as to correspond with that for which we pray as regards our words and our active life. That is a great deal, but that is not all. We have to come down to the practical administrative work which is now laid upon us in connection with our task, a task which has a long history. The meeting to-day has a certain element

20218

of novelty. The bishops of the two provinces are for the first time in public sitting together. Personally I have long desired, and I know that I am not singular in the desire, to see our Convocations thus act. The circumstances which led to our sitting a few hundred miles apart are changed, and, with the change of conditions, I think the question of the advantage of another change has arisen. However, that is not to be dwelt upon to-day. It may be that I am voicing a southern prejudice, and that the Houses of York, or the Lower House at any rate of that province, will, with its northern robustness, repudiate the idea. I only mention it now because the thought comes over one with fresh weight and importance when I look round and see my brothers of both provinces sitting here to-day. I am very sorry to say that we are deprived to-day, through no fault of theirs, of the presence of some of those bishops whom we should most have valued here. The Bishop of London is unwell, the Bishop of Oxford is unwell, and the Bishop of Southwell is unwell—none of them, I hope, very seriously. We are also prevented from having the presence of the Bishop of Salisbury and the Bishop of Southwark, as it is impossible for them to come. It is a really great loss in every case, for they are those to whose words we all attach a great deal of importance.

Not only are we sitting thus together north and south, but also we are sitting, as I have said, for the first time in public. It has not been the usage that the bishops should sit in public, except when they are meeting in the Assembly or in the whole Synod, and sitting with clergy and laity as well. But it has been strongly pressed upon me that at this rather historic juncture in the story of our proceedings there is a widespread wish to know not merely what view the bishops take of the proposed Measure for the revision of our rubrics, but also why they take the view which they take, and what are the grounds on which the opinion which they hold is based. For that reason we have thought that it would be helpful to have a meeting at which members of the House of Clergy and members of the House of Laity and other Churchmen and Churchwomen interested in the matter might be present, and I rejoice to see that we have a goodly gathering to-day. No doubt, my Lords, you will all feel that the bishops are more or less committed to what has been very deliberately and step by step done in Convocation: but I look forward to hearing to-day, from those who are best qualified to give it to us, the arguments for the motion in favour of the general approval of this Measure. I have no doubt that we shall hear also the difficulties, which are certainly real, that attend any action, whatever it be, in a matter so important, so delicate, and so surrounded by pitfalls as this is.

I think it must always be remembered in the House of Bishops how constant is the change of *personnel* among those to whom the task is committed. The bishops who are meeting around me to-day

are not the same body as that to which the Letters of Business were issued in 1906. I wonder whether any of your Lordships realise how great the changes are. In 1906 there were thirty-seven dioceses, and thirty-seven diocesans, to whom the Letters of Business were issued. How many of those are on the active list as members of the House of Bishops to-day? Out of the thirty-seven there are only eight. No less than eighteen who were then alive have died; seven have on grounds of inadequate health resigned; and there are four bishops who are now forming the vigorous and hopeful Province of Wales. We have eight who are, I am glad to say, here to-day. That is the position as regards the past; and it is not without significance when we are sometimes told that we are not wholly consistent at one moment with what we do at another. It is inevitable, but it is not unimportant.

Well, my Lords, we are to listen to the speeches of those who will tell us why they think we should give, as I think we should give, General Approval to the Measure before us—General Approval in the large sense of the words. But before that, may I be pardoned if for a few minutes I remind you in bare outline of the history of this whole matter? It is not unimportant, if there goes out from our gathering to-day a report of what is said, that those who read it, and who are less familiar than your Lordships are with all the circumstances, should have their attention called to the place that our action to-day takes as a sequel to what has happened in the years that have gone by. It is a story of a good many years. I do not think I am wrong in saying that to understand it aright we must go back fifty-five years. In 1867 a Royal Commission was issued to go into the question of past changes in the rubrics, and I do not think it would be out of place or uninteresting to-day if I read the actual words of the material paragraph of the reference that was made to them. You will see how great was the task committed to that Commission, which included bishops, clergy and laity of every school, strong High Churchmen of the day not less than some of the strongest evangelicals:—

> "Whereas it has been represented unto us that differences of practices have arisen from varying interpretations put upon the rubrics, orders and directions for regulating the course and conduct of public worship, the administration of the Sacraments, and the other Services contained in the Book of Common Prayer . . . . and more especially with reference to the ornaments used in the churches and chapels of the said United Church and the vestments worn by the ministers thereof at the time of their administration: And whereas it is expedient that a full and impartial inquiry should be made into the matters aforesaid, with the view of explaining or amending the said rubrics, orders and directions so as to secure general uniformity of practice in such matters as may be deemed essential . . . . We do hereby enjoin you . . . . to make diligent enquiry into all and every the matters aforesaid, and to report thereupon . . . . having regard not only to the said rubrics . . . . but also to any other laws or customs relating to the matters aforesaid, with power to suggest any alterations, improvements, or amendments, with respect to such matters or any of them as you . . . . may think fit to recommend."

It would hardly have been possible to have worded the reference to the Royal Commission in wider or further reaching terms. That Commission, appointed in 1867, issued four reports. It was appointed in June, and with commendable speed it issued a report in August, a preliminary report dealing simply with the question of vestments, and unanimously discouraging (I cannot say attempting absolutely to forbid) the use of vestments. Then they issued a second report in April, 1868, dealing with the question of lights at the Holy Communion, and with the use of incense. Although there were some minority reports couched in very guarded and reserved language, that report also was one of complete discouragement of the uses that were there described. They issued a third report in January, 1870, dealing wholly with the Lectionary. That report was unanimous, and contained the Lectionary with which we have all been familiar from our childhood upwards. The Lectionary of 1871 was the handiwork of that Royal Commission and not of Convocation. Then they issued a fourth report in August, 1870, on the rubrics generally. That was a remarkable document. It dealt largely with the Athanasian Creed, upon which there was a great difference of opinion, and it also dealt with many other subjects. The report had the quite unique characteristic of having (I think I am right in saying) twenty-one minority reports. I think the minority reports came to twenty-one or twenty-two. Some of them were almost identical one with the other, so it is not as strange as it sounds, but there was something like twenty-three reports issued in all. I mention these things, my Lords, because I think it well to bear in mind how difficult the subject has constantly been found, how persistent and varied have been the efforts devoted to trying to deal with these matters, and how great the perplexities are invariably found to be when you get men of different training, different temperament, and different opinions endeavouring to arrive at a united conclusion.

The four reports were all of course submitted to the Crown, and, in consequence, Letters of Business were issued to the Convocations in 1871, and the Convocations were bidden to consider what these reports said and to act accordingly. The proposals of the Lectionary Report had already become law; but the other reports they were asked to consider, and they did consider them in great detail and for a very long time. The Royal Commission itself had recommended rubrical changes down to the very smallest details of punctuation, so that when the Convocations set to work they had not a clean sheet of paper on which to work. During seven long years, or six and a half years, the Convocations debated the answer that they should send to the Letters of Business. I think that I am probably the only man alive—certainly the only man alive—who was present at the Upper House discussions on those occasions. I was there in quite a subordinate capacity, but I shall

always remember that I heard every one of those discussions in the Upper House during the years 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, and 1878. There come before me now the figures of those who were the then protagonists in fields familiar to us all in our discussions of to-day. One thinks of the weight that belonged (and still belongs if you study them) to the utterances of some of those giants of men who handled the matter at that time. The speeches of Bishop Christopher Wordsworth are of the most extraordinary interest as read to-day upon many of the questions that we have been discussing. Bishop George Augustus Selwyn, with his record of Colonial experience, contributed immensely helpfully to the discussions of that time. There was Bishop Moberley, with that wealth of learning which was never at a loss, but always forthcoming to help on those points. There was Bishop Harold Browne, and others, and not least, and always throwing brilliancy into the thing, Bishop Magee. I can see all those men at this moment with my mind's eye, sitting in the smaller room in which the Upper House of Convocation then met, in the Queen Anne's Bounty Office in Dean's Yard, dealing with these subjects in detail. The reports of what was said, given much more fully than the reports which have ordinarily been published since, are well worth reading by anyone to-day who tries to look back. Or if I may be a little egotistical, you will find a full account of the speeches in a book for which I am responsible, the *Life of Archbishop Tait*, which goes through these years and gives a summary of the discussions that took place in the various controversies. What was specially known as the "Cope Compromise" at that time, though entirely out of date now, created an immense stir in those years.

The contrast between then and now as regards the general public knowledge of these questions is very remarkable. People know very much more now than the public did then. The comments on those discussions showed strange ignorance of the questions that were being discussed.

Then in 1878 the two Convocations presented their reports. They were not identical, but they were very nearly the same. There the matter as regards legislation, or attempted legislation, rested. But during the years that followed from 1878 came the long series of discussions, both on ritual, and to some extent on *credenda*, which so filled the primacy of Archbishop Benson. At the very centre of his time came the elaborate Lincoln Judgment, which attracted everybody's attention to these subjects, and, I think we can still say, threw a light upon them. However much we may think now that what was then said was lacking in profundity of insight or wealth of historical knowledge, it was an advance upon anything which had been said before; and I think it is exceedingly hard to challenge in its historical learning or its liturgical acuteness.

THE CHAIRMAN.]

During those years there was plenty of strife going on which culminated in parliamentary questions at the beginning of the present century, just at the time of the South African War and after it. Discussions took place then in Parliament, and the outcome was the issue of another Royal Commission in 1904, of which I was privileged to be a member.

The reference was :—

> "To enquire into the alleged prevalence of breaches or neglect of the law relating to the conduct of Divine Service in the Church of England and to the ornaments and fittings of churches, and to consider the existing powers and procedure applicable to such irregularities, and to make such recommendations as may be deemed requisite for dealing with the aforesaid matters."

That Commission, unlike its predecessor, did not itself attempt to go into the details of the rubrical matters and how they should be amended, but threw its strength (and reported unanimously) into recommending the issue of new Letters of Business to the Convocations as the proper bodies for dealing with and handling the questions. It reported in June, 1906. A few months later, in November, 1906, after a correspondence published at the time and subsequently often referred to between myself and the Governmental authorities, Letters of Business were issued, and were subsequently renewed when a new Parliament met. The Letters of Business of 1906 said :—

> "We bid that you do debate, consider, consult and agree upon the following points, matters and things contained in the recommendations of the said Report" [that is, the Royal Commission Report] "*videlicet* the desirability and the form and contents of a new rubric regulating the ornaments (that is to say, the vesture) of the ministers of the Church at the times of their ministrations, and also of any modifications of the existing law relating to the conduct of Divine Service and to the ornaments and fittings of churches."

That set the Convocations to work afresh upon handling to the best of their power the whole matter. You will have observed that the recommendation was a two-fold one. It referred to the ornaments rubric with regard to the vesture of ministers, and it also referred to the rubrics generally. As soon as the work was begun, it was found how necessary it would be to have learning brought to bear and technical knowledge applied to the elucidation of the ornaments rubric. A Report was drawn up and issued under the chairmanship of Bishop John Wordsworth of Salisbury, and with the aid of Bishop Gibson of Gloucester and the present Bishop of Ely and others, which was a document of the highest historical importance. It is known as Report No. 416 of the Canterbury Convocation on "The Ornaments of the Church and its Ministers." It is a pamphlet of 120 pages, and full of such learning as threw an entirely new light upon the subject. That was only one part of the work, of

course, that was done by the Commission, but it was an extremely important part, and it was done comparatively early.

I hope that I am not trenching upon what will be said by my brother the Bishop of Chichester when he moves the General Approval of the Measure. I am purposely not dealing with the internal matter of the Measure at all: I am merely reminding you how the present proposals came into being. It very soon became apparent that we must deal separately with three matters—the Lectionary, the Psalter, and the Rubrics. With the Lectionary we were able, like our predecessors, to deal. We dealt very carefully and thoroughly and, I venture to think, with extraordinary happy results, with the Committee's Report: the New Lectionary was passed through the Convocations and through the Assembly, and its optional use, the power to use it, is at this moment the law of the land. I hold in my hand the actual Measure, which has given legal validity to that portion of our work. Let that be borne in mind when it is said that nothing practically has been done.

With regard to the Psalter we have a separate Measure, which will be proposed to us, I suppose, to-morrow for our General Approval, which has been fortunately under the wise and trusted guidance and leadership of the Bishop of Ely, who will introduce it to us.

On the rubrics generally the two Convocations reported in April, 1920, in similar but not in identical terms. It is often a mistake to imagine that if the two Convocations have a matter of that sort referred to them, their reports, to be effective, must be identical. They are only recommendations, and the operative action that follows may be based upon what is common to the two, or upon one or the other.

After that came what was possible under the new conditions, but had been impossible before—consideration, not merely by the Convocations, but by the National Church Assembly as a whole. That body has not yet had before it the recommendations or the Measure in detail, but it has had the Report of an extremely strong Committee of the Assembly which dealt with the whole matter, and the Report of that Committee forms the schedule to the Measure to which the Bishop of Chichester will directly ask us to give General Approval.

I have told you the historical setting of what we are doing to-day. It may seem unnecessary to have gone over it, but I am most anxious that it should not be supposed that we are doing something which it was unnecessary to attempt. We are merely fulfilling what has been a constant demand upon us and what we have been pressed for half a century to try to do, and we are trying to do it with such effectiveness as is ours. It is part of a continuous progressive effort to bring about such adaptations of our laws and rules and manner of worship as shall fit the changing circumstances of to-day.

THE CHAIRMAN.]

My Lords, you will agree with me that the first criticism that we are accustomed to hear is, "What an extraordinarily long time these things take. You have been at it for year after year, and you have only produced the result of your debates on the matter in Convocation." Well, I think that upon that there is more than one thing to be said. It has been bound to take a long time because of its extreme importance, its extreme delicacy, and the need of the utmost caution in handling a book that comes down to us with the reverence that we rightly attach to the Book of Common Prayer, and to the great sources from which the Book of Common Prayer was drawn, or the great original of which it is an adaptation. What has happened is not peculiar to the caution or dilatoriness of Churchmen, lay or clerical, in England. The American Church decided many years ago to revise its Prayer Book and its rubrics. How long did it take? Twelve years. The American Church appointed a large and strong committee which sat for three years constantly to deal with the matter. Its report when presented to the Conventions and discussed as a whole took six years more—two Conventions three years apart. Then the report was referred back to the dioceses which took three years more. So that twelve years were occupied by our brothers across the Atlantic in dealing with the matter, showing, and I think it is not difficult to show, how much time is required for doing adequately a task of this kind.

There is a second reason for the long delay, of which we need to remind our critical friends. Until quite recently, until this very last stage, everything was discussed and discussed only in the Convocations (besides the House of Laity which had more or less to do with the matter), the four Houses of the Convocation sitting separately, and sitting, remember, for two or three days only at a time with several months of interval. The difficulties of doing work in that way are enormous as contrasted with the power that a Parliamentary body has, sitting *de die in diem* for weeks or even months on end. It is not merely the difficulty of isolated meetings which render it necessary to go over the ground again to be reminded of where you stand and so on. It is more than that. It lends itself in the most extraordinary way to obstruction, which may or may not be malevolent: obstruction in the sense of opportunity being offered to those who do not want to go forward on the lines suggested. No plan could be devised by the wit of man which would render it so easy for those who wanted to thwart progress, if there were such persons, as the mode in which Convocation has to do its business. I am not alleging, you will observe, that anybody has so desired; but if you can imagine that there may have been people who were not anxious that we should go forward, they certainly had the opportunity placed in their hands to which it is just possible we may ascribe some little part of the long period which has been occupied in doing the work.

But there has been another cause which is so obvious that I need not state it. The War crashed into the last part of our work, and upset everything. It turned people's minds in other directions, occupied our powers of work and filled our thoughts. It distracted us altogether from the detailed work which is wanted for this kind of thing. In addition—and this is of very real and sacred importance to-day—it brought into our common life new thoughts, new suggestions, new discoveries about what was difficult and what was practicable, what was desirable and what men might want. It introduced necessarily habits of irregularity as regards the observance of the rubrics and the like, habits which it was impossible to avoid with masses of men on active service, and yet grew to be customary to those who were to form either the clergy ministering or the people to be ministered to. All these things undoubtedly disturbed, to a very great degree and in a very marked way, the product of the earlier years of discussion and debate to which time had been given.

My Lords, we do want our Prayer Book to correspond with the desire of the soul of the people to whom we want to minister. We do want to meet the uprising wish of people whose thoughts are new, who have had a fresh start and stimulus in their whole religious life. We have had it brought before us in a way that we could not but attend to, and cannot but attend to now and thank God for, if it means that out of the chaos and turmoil and horror of the Great War we have a larger desire for that correspondence of prayer with word and work which we desire to see if prayer is to be worth while.

My Lords, I have told you now what I wanted to say as regards what leads up to the proposal which is to be made to us to-day. I ought to say something, I think, on the question of order. I have had from four different quarters communications to the effect that it is desirable that in dealing with the matter at this stage the Measure should be divided into two parts—that which is controversial and that which is not controversial; and that we should deal with the non-controversial part first, and postpone altogether, or for some considerable time at least, dealing with the controversial parts. That raises a question of order and a question of expediency. As to the question of order the responsibility is mine. I have gone into it very carefully, and I have taken counsel with those who are best able to help in the matter, and I am inclined to say unhesitatingly that that point cannot be raised practically and operatively at this stage. The proposal is really an amendment of the Measure. You cannot simply cut it in two parts and say, "We will take one part apart from the other," because, if you think it out, you will see that that is not what you mean. You mean that the operative part of the Measure should apply to some items in the Schedule first, and then afterwards at another stage to other items in the Schedule. I have

gone into it very carefully, and I have no doubt at all that that must wait until we come to the Stage of Revision, when it obviously will be in order to make a motion of that kind with regard to any particular item or proposal when it comes up. I take full responsibility for that, and I am prepared, if challenged, to give full reasons and to show why.

It also raises a question of expediency, namely, whether it is desirable to do that. That I cannot decide from the Chair. But I think that the matter is so important, and the proposal is so obviously worth considering (I do not say more than that), that I should not feel it justifiable to prevent any one of your Lordships who wishes to do so from showing that such was his intention when the proper time came. That is to say, he could say, "I give general approval to the Measure to-day," or "I withhold general approval from the Measure to-day, on the understanding that when we come to the Revision Stage, if we do come to it, I am then going to do so and so, and I tell you why." That is perfectly justifiable, and I give full scope to any one of your Lordships to say that, if he desires to do so.

I hope that I have now made clear what it is that we are taking in hand to do. Once more I say that it is a matter of the utmost solemnity. I can imagine no greater task or more solemn task that could ever be laid upon us bishops, acting jointly, than to give leadership and guidance as regards the manner of our worship of Almighty God, or bringing the prayers that we offer in the House of God into harmony with the responsibilities of life and action which are ours every day. It is with that thought in mind that I approach—and you, I know, approach—the consideration this afternoon of the proposals which are to be made.

I call upon the Bishop of Chichester to move.

THE BISHOP OF CHICHESTER: Your Grace, I rise to move General Approval of this Measure, and I wish to say first that there is no one who regrets more than I do that I have to take the place of Dr. Gibson, the late Bishop of Gloucester, who was Chairman of the Committee of the National Assembly which presented the Report of which you have already told us.

Our Prayer Book, my Lords, has never been regarded as irreformable. Not to go behind the first that was entirely in English, the book of 1549 was greatly altered in 1552. Subsequent revisions of greater or less extent took place in 1559, 1604, and 1662. There was an abortive attempt at revision in 1689. The non-jurors in the eighteenth century drew up their own order of service. There have long been Scottish and American varieties, themselves revised each once or more: and to-day there are Irish and Canadian Prayer Books, besides those in use in Missionary Dioceses where alterations cannot but arise through translations into languages of a wholly different quality from our own. The whole

form a group of ... held in common, but considerable variety in detail. I do not find any of those common characteristics are represented in the proposals which I now have the honour to lay before you.

Among ourselves, after the Caroline Prayer Book had been in use for nearly 200 years, there grew up a strong desire for considerable reform. Hence arose the Convocation Prayer Book of 1689, which the Archbishops ... 1689, which was drawn up but never authorised, and ... The Shortened Services Act of 1872. ... it was the embodiment of decrees of Convocation ... passed, and I do not see how the subsequent concurrence of Parliament could make it ... Church. But its provisions are ... and from a practical point of view ... repeals a good deal of it.

That was fifty years ago. His Grace has reminded us that the present movement began with the Royal Commission of 1904 and the granting of Letters of Business in 1906. Those Letters of Business were three times renewed and did not receive their answer till 1920, and then only because the procedure by Resolution on certain matters had been wholly altered by the ... "Enabling Act."

It was always intended that before any proposals for revision were made into law the laity of the Church should have the opportunity of discussing them. The Enabling Act has made that not only advisable but necessary. In consequence a joint Committee of members of the Three Houses of the Church Assembly, both of them laymen, ... and some ... the Convocations' Reply to the Letters of Business ... through these proposals carefully accepted the majority of them and changed some. It presented its Report ... The outcome is the Measure and Schedule which I have the honour to submit to you for General Approval. The Schedule contains the actual alterations to our present Prayer Book which we propose. The Measure, if passed, will make the use of them legal.

What is the issue before us at this moment? Not whether we approve of all the items in the Schedule or think that they should be omitted or amended, or others added. The opportunity for that will come later. You will remember that ... General Approval here and in the House of Laity, as it has already received it in the House of Clergy, it will ... amendment in both of those other Houses. We may feel quite confident that any really valuable amendments will be carried, or at least discussed, in one or other of those Houses. Even ... carried in either House *must* ... before the House of Bishops can ... and ... before the ...

in deciding whether they, or any others, are to be incorporated in the Measure or its Schedule, which will then be submitted, first to the Convocations, and then to the National Assembly, for a simple direct vote, Yes or No.

Now, the issue to-day is not one of points of detailed amendment—but just this: Does the Schedule appended to the Measure contain sufficient promise of valuable changes in our services to make it worth while to proceed with the Measure? And does the Measure itself promise to contain adequate provision for authorising these changes under proper safeguards?

But before I try to answer these questions, I must point out with emphasis that the present Measure is entirely permissive. What may be in the future I cannot say. But if this Measure is carried as it stands, there will be no legal necessity compelling any of those clergy or congregations who dread all change to adopt any single part of the Schedule. We propose to sanction an alternative book, which *may* be used as a whole instead of the existing book: and of which any part *may* (not *must*) be used instead of the corresponding part of the existing book. That will be the legal situation. The Measure exercises no compulsion. But there is, I own, a compulsion of another sort. I do not suppose that there is a single Church throughout our dioceses in which the strict letter of the existing Prayer Book is carried out—and that is why some change in the law is so imperatively necessary. And so the Schedule, among other things, aims at legalising practices which are rightly and generally, perhaps universally, adopted among us. If I give a rather trivial instance, it is because I do not wish at this moment to touch on anything controversial. In all churches notices of various kinds are given out during the time of Divine Service: and very few indeed of them fall within the letter of the Prayer Book rule that they must be either prescribed in the Book, or ordered by the King, or enjoined by the Ordinary—that is, in nearly all cases, the Bishop. I am thankful to say we bishops do not receive scores of letters every week asking us to "enjoin" the publication of the notice of the Mothers' Meeting or the Choir Practice. The Schedule by inserting after "enjoined" the two words "or permitted" legalises the existing practice, while retaining, as I think we should, the right of the Ordinary to forbid any improper notice. I think that every church in the kingdom will avail itself of that alteration, however loth to adopt any other.

So I turn to the main question—What valuable proposals does the Schedule contain, and the Measure propose to authorise? I propose to pass over numerous lesser points, and to content myself with mentioning some nine that raise little or no controversy, and then eight of more disputed value. I take them mainly in the order in which they stand in the Schedule, which is, of course, the same as that of the Prayer Book.

First, on page 12 No. 2 (throughout the references will be to "N.A. 84"), the addition of the Festivals of S. Mary Magdalene and the Transfiguration to the red-letter Holy Days. You will find that also on pages 48, 49, and 65. As regards the Transfiguration, so far as my knowledge goes (and I have been concerned with revision first in the Lower House of Convocation and later in the Upper House for 17 years) this is the one and only proposal which has been accepted with entire unanimity whenever it has come up. With regard to S. Mary Magdalene, care has been taken to avoid the unscriptural identification of her with "the woman which was a sinner." She is commemorated as the first to see the Lord after His resurrection.

I take here a similar point, though actually it comes later (pages 17 to 39), namely, the provision of Collects, Epistles and Gospels available for all the "black letter" days except three—Lammas Day, Holy Cross Day, and *O sapientia*. This will not affect the majority of Church people, to whom such days have hitherto meant little more than a series of antiquarian notes in the Calendar. For on Sundays these Epistles and Gospels are not to be used in place of those appointed for the day; at the most there may be added a Collect commemorating S. Augustine, or S. Francis of Assisi, or whoever it may be, in the Sunday service. But in the churches and communities where they have daily celebrations there is more interest in the saints of past ages and other countries and there is a natural desire for occasional variation from the Collect, Epistle and Gospel of the week; and in consequence of this very reason there has often been an anticipation of what is now proposed, more or less under episcopal sanction. I think that it will be a real gain to make those changes legal.

Next, to get to something more important, directions for shortening Morning Prayer and avoiding unnecessary repetition, when either the Holy Communion or the ante-Communion follows immediately. There is widely felt to be a certain unreality, or at least a spiritual strain, in reciting two confessions of sin, two Creeds, and the Lord's Prayer four or even five times within little more than an hour. To meet this difficulty our proposal (p. 15) is two-fold. First, when the Order of Communion follows at once, to allow the omission of the penitential introduction to Morning Prayer, which will then begin with "O Lord, open Thou our lips"; and secondly, in the same case to allow the omission of the Creed and all that follows in Morning Prayer. Where this is done, there will be only one Creed and one Confession, those in the Communion service; and the Lord's Prayer will only be said twice, and the Creed only once, namely, at the points where they come in the Communion service. It is, of course, open to anyone to think that the same end might have been better gained in some other way; that would be a matter for an amendment at a later stage, but I am confident that your

Lordships will give general approval to our making some attempt to lessen these repetitions.

Similarly, there are not a few who feel that the monotony of the same opening to Mattins and Evensong day after day throughout the year tends to increase the danger that is always with us, of formalism and unreality. We therefore propose to permit the omission of "Dearly beloved," excepting on two Sundays in the year, and also provide an alternative form of Confession and Absolution. This is both for Morning and Evening Service (pages 15 to 18). We hope in this way to bring more devotion into a part of the service where unreality is especially deplorable.

Next, there is some enrichment of the offices of Morning and Evening Prayer: (*a*) By adding Invitatories, which may be used on the great Festivals before the Venite, so striking the note of the day at a very early period in the service (pages 16 and 17). (*b*) By providing many more prayers of Intercession to be used after the Third Collect, including among them prayers for Missions Overseas (pages 28 to 37). (*c*) By offering an alternative ending for Evensong, instead of what are commonly called the five State Prayers (pages 18 to 20). (*d*) By providing a wholly different service, in fact a form of Compline, to be used when Evensong has already been said (pages 21 to 24). These enrichments will, we believe, be welcomed, some in one place, some in another; and, I expect, all of them somewhere at any rate.

Next, in the Communion Service we propose the permissive use of proper Prefaces for many more occasions, and prolonged use of the Christmas and Easter Prefaces: the Easter Preface all through the Easter season up to the Ascension (pages 64 to 66). We have sincere sympathy with the Reformers' wish to simplify the old services, or rather, perhaps, the old service books: but in this case, at any rate, we think they went too far.

It is a smaller matter, but not unimportant, that we propose that in the alternative Prayer Book two of the three long exhortations that come in the Communion Service should be removed to the end of the service, thus making it easier for those to whom books are not familiar to find their place as the service proceeds (pages 63 and 64).

We alter the rubrics which direct the reading of the third Exhortation from a requirement, which I think now no one obeys, to what can well be done in every church in the country. Just because the existing rubric asked too much, namely, that the Exhortation should be read at every celebration, it has often been totally disobeyed; and by only asking that it should be read three times a year, and not necessarily at a celebration at all (for instance, it might be at a service of preparation for Holy Communion), and so making obedience possible, we hope to reinstate that valuable preface in the ears and minds of the people.

Then we have attempted to remove certain causes of distress and even scandal to both priest and people, without changing the doctrine of the Church. Thus in the Service for Public Baptism of Infants we have changed "sins" into "sin" (pages 71 to 73), because the words used seem to suggest that an infant could already be guilty of actual sins; but we have not touched on the truth that there is some sort of "original sin," or, as I would rather call it, "inherited guilt," in every child of man (Page 71).

Similarly, words about God's wrath are omitted as inapplicable to infants, and suggesting strange misconceptions, while they are based on an entire misunderstanding of some words in S. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians.

In the present Marriage Service there are words of outspoken plainness, which the squeamishness of the day will not listen to in church. In consequence, whole sentences, and even a most important Collect, are often omitted. We propose to soften the language, but retain the message which the Church wishes to deliver on the primary purpose of marriage (pages 86 to 88).

In the Burial Service similarly there are phrases which become unreal and cause offence in exceptional but not uncommon cases. We provide an alternative form of committal of the body to the grave, and alternative services, which will, we hope, relieve consciences and prevent unreality (page 103). There are other improvements in the Burial Service, but I must not go into them now.

In the Confirmation Service (pages 83 to 85) we propose two changes, which will appeal with special force to us bishops, who are so frequently using it: (1) We prefix Scripture with an exposition of the passage, and cease to order the public reading of the present preface, retaining it, however, as a rubric. That was the position which it held for 100 years, before the revision of 1662. Many of us have desired, and may even have introduced, the reading of Scripture in that service. Many have felt that the present preface is rather difficult to follow, and scarcely appropriate at that very solemn moment in the child's life. (2) There are constantly cases where candidates have been baptized as adults and so made the baptismal promises with their own mouth; and there are many who have been baptized by Nonconformists, or others who do not have Godparents, and perhaps no public promises at all. In both these classes of cases the existing question is worded inappropriately, and so we propose an alternative form of question, which in reality involves exactly the same thing as the old, and will be a real relief to many of us.

The proposals which deal with the Visitation of the Sick contain a real enrichment of the Book (pages 91 to 99). These were for the most part added by the Committee of the National Assembly.

Next we put forward a new form of the Commination Service (page 115), where again, by meeting widely felt difficulties, we hope

to restore to use what is edifying, but has become unpopular. This also comes from the National Assembly Committee.

We try to relieve the trouble caused by misinterpretation of the question in the Ordering of Deacons about belief in the Scriptures by substituting a new form of words (page 118).

In very nearly, if not quite all of these cases the language of the existing Book is really defensible; but it has to be explained and defended. That is the trouble. It is far more important for the parish priest to be teaching the fundamentals of the Faith and expounding the Scriptures, than to be justifying the words of the Prayer Book. He cannot go on perpetually labouring to remove such stumbling-blocks as I have mentioned. In a congregation of 500 perhaps two or three have noticed them. It may be a most serious matter to these individuals; but you cannot expect the 500 to be listening patiently while the other two or three are taught; and probably it is just those two or three who will not go and seek out the clergyman and ask him, or attend a study circle or any other provision made for expounding the Prayer Book in the parishes.

I have dwelt at some length on these points, for which I claim general consent, because people do not always give full value to what is not controversial, and therefore make less stir in debate and in the public press. In my own opinion the improvements I have enumerated, even if ultimately no others were to be carried, would be sufficient to justify your Lordships in giving General Approval to the Measure. But I must turn to more controversial points.

(1) Proper Psalms are appointed for every Sunday of the year, instead of leaving it to the chances of the Calendar. Generally speaking, the selection is somewhat shorter (pages 7 and 8).

(2) There comes in the very difficult matter of the *Quicunque vult* —the Athanasian Creed. We propose first to leave it in its present place in the Prayer Book, but in the Revised Translation issued in 1917; and, secondly, to withdraw the rubric requiring it to be substituted for the Apostles' Creed on 13 holy-days, including Christmas, Easter and Whit-sunday. We substitute permission to use it in place of the Apostles' Creed on Trinity Sunday morning or evening. It can, of course, also be sung in whole or in part, in procession or as an anthem, on any other occasion. That requires no permission by rubric.

(3) We provide carefully worded prayers and thanksgivings for the faithful departed on primitive lines, that is, with no mention or hint of their suffering punishment in the time between death and the Day of Judgment (pages 20, 29, 69, and 104). That is obviously a proposal that is likely to be challenged: but this does not seem to me to be the right moment to discuss it.

(4) I come to a matter of prolonged contention, namely, the Eucharistic vestments. This question, as his Grace the Archbishop reminded us, had a very prominent place in the Report of the Royal

Commission of 1904, and was expressly mentioned in the Letters of Business that followed. As everyone knows, it turns on the interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric. We do not attempt to solve that knotty problem of interpretation, but try to give it the go-by by a fresh enactment permitting either of the two common uses. The older among us remember how another dispute was ended in a somewhat similar way. What is called the eastward position was a matter of fierce controversy during the seventies and eighties, until Archbishop Benson proved that either position was in accordance with a reasonable interpretation of the rubrics concerned. Since then the variety of practice has continued, but with a complete absence of acrimony or accusations of law-breaking on either side. We aim at securing similar peace over the question of the robes to be worn by the celebrant at Holy Communion. As I have said, we leave the Ornaments Rubric as it stands; and, of course, it applies to many other things besides the Eucharistic vestments. We insert a new rubric or note at the beginning of the Order of Holy Communion:—

> Page 60. "For the avoidance of all controversy and doubtfulness, it is hereby prescribed that notwithstanding anything that is elsewhere enjoined in any Rubric or Canon, the Priest in celebrating the Holy Communion shall wear either a surplice with stole or with scarf and hood, or a white alb plain with a vestment or cope."

Perhaps I ought to say in explanation that the last words are understood and intended to be a technically correct description of the Eucharistic vestments as commonly worn, including amice, girdle, stole and maniple, as well as alb and chasuble. If that note is adopted and secures a cessation of controversy on this point, that alone will be worth the 17 years we have spent over Prayer Book revision.

(5) Next comes the recitation of the Commandments. Here we have to deal with two causes of stumbling: (1) The reiteration of the same form, in many cases day after day, sometimes three or four times on the same day; (2) the temporary and Judaic character of the sentences attached to the Command itself. For instance: "that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee," means that the Children of Israel may remain long in Palestine, and requires mental translation to make it apply to our country; and such mental translation involves an effort that is out of place when you ought to be thinking of your sins.

Again, many of us who love the first chapter of Genesis, and read it with joy in public or private, find it a strain to follow Exodus (not, I may point out in passing, Deuteronomy) in assigning as *the* reason for observing one day in seven a narrative of the Creation which we believe to be true, but in symbol and figure. We therefore, while of course as in all other cases those who like may continue to use the familiar form, propose to allow: (1) The use of a shortened form of

the Ten Words which retain the full force of their commands and prohibitions ; (2) the use (except on Sundays in Advent and Lent) of what is known as the Evangelical Summary, as is done in many of the sister Churches of our group ; (3) the use, except on the same Sundays, of the Kyrie without the Commandments. The very name "Kyrie" shows the antiquity of the word, for it comes to us in the West of Europe in Greek guise ; that is, it dates from the time when the Christians in Rome spoke Greek not Latin, and the Church was still undivided.

(6) We propose an alteration in the Canon, and the transference of the Prayer of Humble Access, so as to precede *Sursum Corda*.

(7) We propose to permit, in accordance with primitive and world-wide usage, Reservation of the Sacrament for the Communion of the Sick.

On these two matters there will be much debate when the time comes for considering the Schedule point by point, for there are serious and deep differences of opinion about them. I trust that we shall all approach the discussion with an earnest desire to reach a really satisfactory conclusion on matters which are of such high importance, both in their administrative aspect and their bearing on the principles and teaching of the Church of England.

At this moment I propose only to say two things, both about Reservation : (1) I believe that scarcely anyone is opposed to Reservation in itself. The difficulty is that many think that in any form it must open the door to what they, and others who are more hopeful about it, hold would be deplorable misuse of the permission. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that the terms of our proposal, or of any other, should be scrutinised with the utmost care, and discussed not only with charity and sympathy, but with prudence and insight ; (2) I wish to draw your Lordships' attention to the paragraph on page 100, lines 33 to 39. This, again, is important, and I rather hope that you will look it up now. We try to provide that further regulations, which must of necessity go into detail, may be made, not by each bishop acting separately and independently, but by the enactment of Canon ; or (what is far more probable in nine cases out of ten) by the Provincial Colleges of Bishops assembled in their Convocations of Canterbury and York.

(8) The last of the more debatable points is the omission of certain verses in the Psalms, not, of course, as printed in the Bible, but as ordered to be used in public worship in church (pages 116 and 117). They are omitted either because the text is corrupt, or the meaning of the Hebrew quite uncertain, or because they are liable to be used to express an un-Christian attitude towards personal enemies. Where the sense is the condemnation of sin, or the expression of God's indignation against wickedness, no omission is proposed. It is only when the human side of personal wrath appears to predominate that the verses seem unsuitable in public worship.

Thus no such alteration is proposed in three Psalms (I might mention many others)—in the 50th with its proclamation of God's judgment, especially against those who sin by adultery, theft, and slander, and yet preach God's law; or in the 89th, about God's chastisement of sinners, visiting offences with the rod and sin with scourges; or in the 139th, "Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate Thee: and am not I grieved with those that rise up against Thee?"

I sincerely hope that all these changes in the Book of Common Prayer may be carried and become legal. I hold that they would relieve many consciences, remove undesirable repetitions, and give fresh point to many of our services. But if we carried only the first nine, about which I believe there is scarcely any opposition in principle, I should say it was well worth while to proceed with the Measure.

My Lords, I have very little to say about the Measure itself at this moment. In my opinion a certain number of amendments in it are necessary to secure our ends, and I have circulated some among the "Members in Charge." They do not, I believe, involve any question of principle at all. I do not think I need say more about that now, but I shall be glad to try to answer any question that any of your Lordships wish to put to me.

I am afraid that I have kept you for a very long time, but I could hardly help it. I will now end by taking up the last words of the Preface to the Prayer Book: "We have good hope that what is here presented, and hath been with great diligence examined and compiled, will be also well accepted and approved by all sober, peaceable and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England."

The Bishop of Truro: Your Grace,—I am seconding the motion that general approval be given to the Measure, and in doing so I want to make a few observations. The Bishop of Chichester has so throroughly dealt with the whole programme of the Measure that in detail there is little to add.

The Measure before us does not pretend to be perfect, and it does not pretend to be final. The proposals for revision on this occasion differ from the proposals for revision that have been made on other occasions, whether they were merely proposals and perished as such, or whether they were carried through. In the past it has always been the custom to substitute a new Book for the old. That happened in 1552, in the Elizabethan Revision, in 1604, and in the Caroline Revision which we at present use. It would have happened in the abortive effort of 1689. But now the proposal is that there shall be an alternative use. That does not necessarily mean that the alternative use will go on for ever (speaking for myself I sincerely hope that it will not), but that for ten years or twenty years, or it may be for forty years, we may suffer alternative uses, and then at a happier moment, when we have learned experience from experiment, we may

sit down again to revise our Book. The reason why one is able to speak hopefully of that kind of procedure to-day is that now we have an organisation by which it can be done. In the past we had only the cumbrous method of an Act of Uniformity: now we have the National Assembly, with all the freedom that it gives us.

I confess that I dislike the idea of an alternative use altogether. It seems to me to be a very sad reflection on our story that in the twentieth century of the Christian era we are not so sufficiently agreed about some grave problems that we can accept one use. But the fact is the fact, and it is better to face facts than to attempt to burke them.

But there is something beside the difference of view to account for an alternative use. There are different classes of the community whom we wish to lead in prayer; there are different types of parishes, different standards of education, and different stages of growth in the spiritual life. I confess that my interest in Prayer Book revision began when years ago I served as incumbent in what is sometimes called—I do not like the term: I only use it for convenience—a slum parish, on the banks of the Mersey. There perforce, with all the goodwill in the world, one was compelled, to a certain extent, to revise the Prayer Book. Our alternative uses will give opportunity for revision in an orderly way. The proposal, in two words, is for an ordered elasticity. There are a few people amongst us, it may be, who rather enjoy breaking rules and regulations: but most of us would be glad of order, and most of us are longing, I believe, for the day to come when all the things which we do shall be done under the proper authority of the whole Church. In large measure the proposals before us to-day are the fruit of years of labour to secure order, and to secure it (to paraphrase) broad-based upon the Church's will.

As the Bishop of Chichester has pointed out, the new Book, the alternative use, adapts to modern ends some of those prayers and services that in the passage of the centuries have ceased to be applicable. The illustration that he gave us of the Confirmation Service seems to me, perhaps, one of the best in the Book: but from the point of view of an old parish priest, I would like to point to another, the Baptismal Office. We are sometimes told, as an argument against any change in what are called the occasional offices of the Church, that if the parish priests only taught their people properly, there would be no occasion for change. As an old parish priest, I would like to point out that that kind of suggestion is based upon a complete fallacy. People come to church to be taught on those very rare occasions, and we then teach them in unintelligible terms. We shall not need to do so in the days to come. In all kinds of ways new prayers are added, and the Book is enriched. In all kinds of ways the Book is made more intelligible.

I need say no more on that particular side of the subject; but I remember that when first we put our hands to this task (and it was

your Grace who called me to it in the year 1907) a good deal of anxiety was expressed on every hand, and in some quarters assurances were given that there would be no change in what was called the doctrinal balance of the Prayer Book. I believe that the whole way through most of us who have been engaged in this task have tried quite loyally and rightly to carry out that principle.

It seems to me that I had better dare to say a word or two, even at the risk of seeming to be controversial, about the very patent fact (and therefore it had better be expressed) that there are schools of thought among us divergent the one from the other. I prefer the words "schools of thought" to the word "party," because I like to think of the schools of thought in the Church contributing their share to the common treasury of the Church, rather than of parties fighting for their own ends in it. I think that it is true to say that in the Measure before us we have, in its elasticity, a real recognition of the fact that there are schools of thought amongst us. I believe that there is room for all, subject to a common loyalty to fellowship and truth. Perhaps I am a convenient person to allude to this aspect of the subject, because I speak as a member of a school of thought who is administering a diocese largely of an entirely different school of thought; not at all with unhappiness, but with a good deal better understanding on my own part, and I venture to think on the part of my diocese, of that for which each school of thought stands. It is perfectly true that we must guard the truth as God has revealed it to us; but it is equally true that it is our task, in the interests of fellowship, to attempt to meet those of other views. I must not reveal the secrets of our Committee: but I think that the kind of way in which men of widely divergent schools of thought attempted to understand, and to meet and to be considerate to, those from whom they differed, is one of the most treasured memories of the work that we did together. When I have said that, I wish that I could stop and say no more; but a little more must be said. In the effort to be considerate the one to the other, some of us went as far as we possibly could in loyalty to truth. It was not compromise: it was Christian considerateness. As you will remember, some, not of our own House, but of the lay House, found themselves unable to sign the Report on one particular matter to which the Bishop of Chichester has already referred. The whole task that lies in front of us is to seek unity, and to seek truth: and unity and truth, if they be whole, need not be sacrificed the one to the other.

Since the publication of the Report new factors have arisen in the situation, and we of the House of Bishops have had a letter addressed to us by one whom we all honoured, even if we did not agree with him; one whom I love, for I served him as chaplain for years, Bishop Knox of Manchester. We have had put into our hands to-day a proposal with a preface by the present Bishop of Manchester. We have had a large volume of amendments put

together and printed in the name of a great society existing in the Church of England. I want to say a word or two about that volume of amendments. I am glad indeed of the spirit in which they are prefaced. I am glad, and shall be glad when we come to the stage of Revision (as I hope we shall), to consider them carefully and fairly. But I hope that there will be no kind of misunderstanding. It does seem to me that there is a very real danger at this stage that we should forget that considerateness that has so far existed and at the last become a little selfish. I venture to quote a sentence and then to explain what I mean. In the Report containing amendments to which I have referred there comes this sentence: "We merely ask for permission to say and do the things which we *do* desire to say and do." I do not want to be critical; but it does seem to me that that sentence involves us in the danger of anarchy on the one hand or of a rather decidedly individualistic Protestantism on the other hand. It suggests that the proper way of settling this matter is that we shall all do that which is right in our own eyes. I do venture to say that that is not the right way in which to get our work done. It has been alleged sometimes that N.A. 60 or N.A. 84, as it is now, will please nobody. Is our Prayer Book to be framed simply to please the selfish aspirations of one school of thought or another? Is it not, after all, to be the book in which, from our hearts, we may lead our people in prayer to God? So at that point the thought of our people comes in. As your Lordships will remember, in N.A. 60 we suggested for the National Assembly that a resolution should be passed. It is on page 7 of N.A. 60. I am sorry that it does not occur in N.A. 84. For myself, I wish that it did. It was a resolution suggesting that it is desirable that "changes, even within the bounds of what is legal, should not be made without the goodwill of the people." That has been left out of N.A.84, and the alternative use is left wholly in the hands of the minister, apparently because of the quite natural desire not to interfere with the right of the minister *in sacris*, and partly because of the extreme difficulty of providing an arrangement satisfactory to all concerned. At present the use of the alternative is left to the minister. I have good hope that that will mean, in practice, that minister and people will talk the thing over together before they make changes. We cannot legislate—it would be quite absurd and degrading for the Church of England to legislate—simply for cantankerous people. Most of us are reasonable. I believe that people are growing more reasonable as the years go by in this kind of matter. I have good hope that if we get these alternative uses properly regularised, minister and people will consider them together before they adopt particular changes.

There is one other matter to which for a moment I want to refer; I mean the proposal for Reservation for the Sick. The Bishop of Chichester has told us that it is primitive and catholic:

but there have grown up amongst us here and there, not perhaps largely, but still with a little exceptional publicity, practices in connection with the Reserved Sacrament that I venture to suggest are neither primitive nor catholic. The Eastern Church excludes absolutely the kind of practice to which I am referring. We of the Anglican Church are not, at least I am not, in the very least ashamed of the Reformation. I believe that there were some things that were done in the Reformation period which we might well undo now; but it will be an ill day for the Church of England if we allow ourselves to become a pale shadow of Rome. There is danger in that direction. It seems to me that this whole question of administering the Sacrament to the sick can be carefully guarded, and should be carefully guarded, and if we put our hands to the task in the spirit of truth, and in the spirit of unity, we can so guard it. There may be a few who want more than we can give them. If so, it must be so. It may happen, for a little while at least, that some of these very controversial matters will have to be excluded from the Measure in the kind of way that you, your Grace, have suggested the possibility of doing: but I ask that this House will give General Approval to the Measure: and then we can sit down to amend it, loyal to Christ, loyal to the Church Catholic, loyal to our own branch of it, and loyal to one another, and make, not a perfect settlement, but something that will carry us happily along for a little while to the day when an even more perfect settlement can be made.

The Bishop of Durham: Your Grace,—I will say at once that is my intention to vote for General Approval: but I can only do so by availing myself of your Grace's permission to make important reservations, and to state publicly what they are, and the reasons why I must make them.

I have had very great difficulty in determining the course which I ought to adopt, for Revision of the Prayer Book has hitherto been associated with crises of vital importance in the history of the Church of England. The Elizabethan Settlement disclosed its distinctive character in the few changes which were made in the second Edwardian Book. The Caroline Re-settlement did as much in the more numerous changes which were made in 1661. We must not forget that both those revisions were followed, sooner or later, by large secessions, in the one case of the Roman Catholics, and in the other case of the Nonconformists. I cannot doubt that the present revision, if it be carried through, will not be less significant, nor will its result be less decisive. Accordingly, your Grace, if I assent to General Approval of the revision, I must have very cogent reasons for doing so.

It is a very noteworthy thing that there is no public demand for any revision at all. ("No.") That is my opinion. Such demand as there is appears to me to be almost wholly clerical, and even so,

to be curiously limited. Perhaps the reason is twofold—a fear that revision may make more difficulties than it removes: and a consciousness that whatever changes may be legalised have been, almost without exception, already made without legal authority, but with complete immunity from legal consequence. No doubt if the proposals are adopted and passed into law, scrupulous consciences, if any such survive, will be relieved by being rid of the guilt of law breaking; but the practical effect of the revision will be almost imperceptible.

Here, your Grace, I beg leave to observe that in discussing the question we ought to discuss it as one of Prayer Book revision simply, without regard to the fact at this stage that the revised Book is permissive only. For, as the Lambeth Conference reminded us, the Book of Common Prayer is the Anglican standard of doctrine and practice, and therefore whatever the Church does to the Prayer Book involves an authoritative treatment of its principal standard.

I do not think that it is true to say, as I recall the facts, that the Church of England is committed by this Measure to what has been called a policy of alternative rites. I speak under the correction of your Grace's recollection; but my recollection (and I was, I think by your Grace, placed on the original Committee of Revision) is that the design of an alternative use as an Appendix to the Prayer Book arose from a great desire in some quarters to prevent the Prayer Book being brought under discussion in the House of Commons. That danger has been practically removed by the Enabling Act. The plan has been defended as providing a method by which the changes which are made may, for a certain period, be subjected to the test of experience, and when experience has proved them to be edifying and acceptable, they may be incorporated in the standard of the Book itself. There is no policy of alternative rites in question, and I cannot imagine myself accepting such a policy.

What, then, is the effective demand for revision, and whence does it come? Your Grace has already reminded us. The answer is to be found in the Report of the Royal Commission of 1906. The ten Recommendations of that Commission are expressly said to be designed as a complete scheme, and must be considered mutually dependent. The revision of the Prayer Book is recommended as part of a plan for the restoration of discipline in the Church of England, and it is associated, and indissolubly associated, with a drastic revision of the legal system.

It is solely as an indispensable condition of restoring discipline in the Church of England that Prayer Book revision has been undertaken, and nothing else can provide an adequate justification for so grave an undertaking. If the new rubrics shall be no better obeyed than the old, if the authority of the Church of England to enforce the revised Book shall be as insufficient as it has notoriously been to enforce the existing Book, we shall have laboured for nought. The

case will even be worse than that, for the proposed changes are largely of the nature of concessions to the law-breaking party.

I would say just one word in passing on law-breaking. The Bishop of Chichester spoke as if law-breaking were a universal condition of churchmanship in present circumstances. Law-breaking, it is urged, has been universal, and of course in a sense that is true: for indeed a measure of law-breaking, if you can call it law-breaking, is inevitable not only in ecclesiastical law, but in every kind of law, after a certain lapse of time with its inevitable changes has passed over the community in which the law holds. But the so-called "Catholic" party stands absolutely alone in breaking the law on principle, that is, in repudiating the law itself. There is something less than justice, I think, and a great deal of misfortune and misconception in ignoring that distinction. Unless, therefore, by what we do now we can remove the principle of law-breaking, we shall have gained nothing by our changes of the law itself. It is precisely in order to get at the root of the mischief that a revision of the legal system was recommended as integral to the general scheme of restoring discipline. These are the words of the Report :—

> "The establishment of a Court the authority of which could not be disputed would destroy any foundation for the claim now in fact made by a section of the clergy to decide for themselves the limits of canonical obedience."

Have we any reason for thinking that the party in deference to whose demands the revision has been mainly undertaken will obey the proposed rubrics if they become law?

Take the proposed rubric which the Bishop of Chichester animadverted upon very justly as highly controversial, and which I observe has attracted more notice and provoked more discussion than any other, the proposed rubric which authorises Reservation. This rubric is identical with that agreed upon by the Bishops of the Canterbury Province in February, 1917, when the Bishop of Oxford moved its reaffirmation. At that time, just before the debate, a memorial signed by little short of a thousand clergy was sent to the Bishops. I have it here. What did it say?

> "It being understood that an attempt is about to be made to deny to the faithful the right of access to the reserved sacrament for the purpose of devotion, we the undersigned think it our duty to state our conviction that compliance with such a restriction cannot rightly be demanded and will not be given."

That was in 1917. Have we any reason to think that these clergy, one thousand of them, have altered their minds? The Anglo-Catholic Movement started in the year 1920, and it gives a very clear answer to my question. Here I hold in my hand a little book written by a man of great learning, widely known in the Church, the Principal of Pusey House, Oxford, Dr. Darwell Stone. He deals with the subject of Reservation. What does he tell us?

I might quote a great deal ; but I limit myself to a single paragraph : -

> "If the bishop of the diocese demands that he be kept informed of the method in which the Sacrament is reserved, in order that he may satisfy himself that the method permits both security and reverence, he is but asking what he has a right to know ; but to whatever extent this right may be exercised or neglected, it is the duty of the parish priest to take care not only that the Sacrament be reserved, but also that the conditions of the Reservation be such as the truth concerning the Sacrament demands."

Then he proceeds to argue at considerable length that that truth requires adoration and devotion. As a reasonable man, before I commit myself to a rubric giving the authority of the Church to Reservation under most careful conditions, limiting it for the purpose of the sick, I must have some kind of reason for being reasonably assured that that rubric will be obeyed, and at present I honestly say those reasons are to seek.

The English Church Union Report, to which the Bishop of Chichester referred, claims the right as an integral part of the parish priest's office to reserve the Sacrament in every parish church, not merely for the sick, but for the purposes of communion generally. In connection with that claim an extensive provision is being organised for the setting up of tabernacles in the parish churches, in order that the Reserved Sacrament may be thus preserved and accessible for use. At this critical moment, when I am asked to assent to a rubric of this kind, I cannot possibly ignore the fact that large numbers of the clergy assure me that they will not obey it if it is passed. I do not think that you will say, because it would not be polite or reasonable to say it, that these statements can be put aside as mere extravagances of unimportant individuals.

The Anglo-Catholic Priests' Convention in Oxford in 1921—I am sorry that the Bishop of Oxford is not present—agreed that there was to be a great evangelistic movement made after the second Anglo-Catholic Congress, over which I understand his Lordship of London (who is also absent on this occasion) will preside, in the summer. Now note this : The Federation of Catholic Priests is to be charged to train the clergy for this great effort. The Federation of Catholic Priests has sufficiently disclosed its character and its tendency in the remarkable memorial which it addressed to the bishops not very long ago, to the character of which I called the attention of your Lordships not very long past. This Federation includes, we are assured, more than twelve hundred priests of the Church of England. Those twelve hundred priests, including, it is not extravagant to presume, the one thousand who will not obey the rubric on Reservation, constitute a very considerable section of the working clergy ; and until we can have some assurance that the law will enforce the new rubrics whatever they may be, I do not think that we can be reasonably asked at this stage to commit ourselves to passing those rubrics.

In view of the character and aggressive activity of the Anglo-

Catholic Movement, I personally, speaking with full responsibility as Bishop of Durham, cannot consent to the proposals that affect the Holy Communion until I have assurance that the new rubric will be enforced. I shall therefore vote for General Approval now, with the intention, of which I beg formally to give public notice, of opposing the proposals No. 18 and No. 27, which affect the handling of the Holy Communion. Those proposals ought, in my judgment, to stand over until the Church is provided with a legal machinery which the general conscience of the clergy sanctions, and which therefore the bishops can use effectively in restraint of disobedience. I am prepared to meet frankly the objections which, on conscientious grounds, a large number of the clergy now present against the existing legal system. I desire to meet them on the common ground that if we are loyal members of the Church of England, we must desire that its laws should be enforced and its discipline maintained. When therefore we have got a legal system which our consciences, your consciences and mine, can agree in supporting and endorsing, then there can be no hardship, I think, on any loyal member in having that system brought into effective use. Then, and not till then, can we reasonably consider what concessions we can make to those who desire alteration in the Communion Office, and in the rubrics which determine the treatment of the Holy Sacrament. Until this assurance of enforcement is received, we can hardly consider these proposals on their merits. When we come to the people of England, and ask them to accept changes which I think it is not improbable are very unwelcome to the general body of English people, we must at least be able to tell them that this is part of a system for restoring discipline and enforcing law. We cannot, without that assurance, help considering them in their bearing on the domestic conflict which the Tractarians began, and which their latest disciples are carrying on. There is hardly one, if one, of all those nine controversial proposals which the Bishop of Chichester indicated and commented upon, which might not fairly be accepted in the interests of ecclesiastical peace. But if they are to be used as strategic points in the continuing warfare against the English version of Christianity, then there is not one of them which can prudently be conceded. Willingness to have the law enforced against those who deliberately break it is the test of loyalty to the Church of England, and such enforcement, in the present circumstances of the Church, requires such a careful and thorough revision of our legal machinery as the Royal Commission of 1906 recommended. I for one pledge myself, with such small influence as I may possess, in endeavouring to secure the postponement of those controversial proposals which I have mentioned, to do my best to secure that this revision of the legal machinery is undertaken without delay, and carried through to effect.

The real issue of Prayer Book revision is (and here, your Grace, I would like to cry this from the housetops throughout the nation) the reassertion of the authority of the Church of England over its own clergy. Everything else is petty. If we fail here, we had better attempt nothing. To spend time and labour over framing new rubrics which will not be obeyed, and providing new forms which will not be used, is to plough the sand. We shall deserve the contemptuous description which Archbishop Magee made of the bishops similarly employed in 1880: "We bishops have been sitting in the back attic of the Church blandly discussing the papering of it, with the house on fire in the kitchen, and burglars breaking in at the parlour windows." Alexander Knox is credited with the description of the Church of England as "the most good-natured Church in the world." Good nature is a pleasant and amiable quality that lightens the intercourse of men and women in society; but good nature may not be indulged with impunity, and on the whole it is more a vice than a virtue in rulers. Ecclesiastically, I understand, it is called "the sin of Eli." On us, the bishops of England, a grave responsibility is resting. We, beyond other men, are pledged to guard the treasure of truth and wisdom which, in the Church of England, the English people has inherited. The sane and moderate religion of the Prayer Book is now really imperilled, and English clergymen in considerable numbers are eagerly active in substituting for it the very type of piety which the Prayer Book was framed to discourage. Woe to us if, in order to escape a disagreeable task, we flinch from our manifest duty. It is high time that the mind of the Church of England was known on the new and insistent challenge which the Anglo-Catholics are offering to all that is distinctive in her established system. Is the teaching of the publications of the Society of S. Peter and S. Paul, the official publishers of the Anglo-Catholic Movement, who propose themselves as the "publishers of the Church of England," really accordant with the teaching of the Church of England? After four centuries, does the Church of England really wish to restore the Mass and the Confessional to the central place which they held before the Reformation, which they hold in the Roman Catholic Church, and which beyond all question they hold in the teaching of the Anglo-Catholics? When reviewing "the Anglican standard of doctrine and practice," these questions cannot be avoided, and ought to be answered.

Your Grace, this morning, before I left to come up to town for this meeting, I went into the glorious chapel which it is the particular privilege of the Bishops of Durham to hold, and I prayed that God's Spirit might guide us in the decisions which we must make, and that He might not disdain to guide me in the course which I should take. I was standing by the grave of Bishop Lightfoot and my eyes fell upon the words inscribed on his grave cover:

"Ἀνδριζεσθε, κραταιοῦσθε," "Quit you like men, be strong." The reason why the bishops of England have so largely lost ground and influence in this great nation is because again and again they have adopted the policy which the Bishop of Chichester admirably described in the phrase "attempting to give the problem the go-by," instead of standing up to it and meeting it frankly, and finding a solution. Though it be the eleventh hour, it is, I think, still possible, if we address ourselves with candour, courage and charity to the great task before us, to recover the confidence of the English people, and to open a new chapter of influence and work for the Church of England.

(*The Benediction was pronounced by the Chairman, and the House adjourned until the next morning.*)

SECOND DAY.

The Session was resumed on Tuesday, April 17, *at* 10.30 *a.m., His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury being in the Chair.*

The Bishop of Ripon: Your Grace, I venture with considerable hesitation to say a few words upon this very solemn subject. I should like, first of all, to say a word or two about the speech which the Bishop of Durham made last night. In many respects I am in cordial agreement with many of the things that he said, although I do not think that this would lead me to the same practical point. So far as I am at present advised, I shall not only vote for General Approval to-day, but I should accept the particular resolutions that he gave us notice he was not able to accept. It is, I think, very important to bear in mind the point with which the Bishop began—namely, that we are really making a revision of the Prayer Book, although we have given it another name and another form. I have always regretted that, instead of boldly dealing with the Prayer Book, we have taken the line of avoiding the question of revising the Prayer Book by drawing up a schedule. Perhaps I may say in passing that I have been for all these seventeen years a member of the various Committees concerned with the Prayer Book, and am now accustomed to the variety of systems of nomenclature. We used to call it an appendix; then we called it a supplement, and now it is called a schedule; but the main result is that it does alter the rubrics in various ways. I need only mention one instance. At the present moment the Prayer Book orders that the *Quicunque vult* shall be recited on thirteen days in the year, and we propose that it should be only recited optionally on Trinity Sunday. No one can say that that is not an alteration of the state of things existing in the Prayer Book. Therefore, although we call it a schedule of permissive uses, it is in

fact a revision, and must be treated quite as solemnly and quite as seriously as if it were a revision, and was going to be permanent. The one advantage that I can see in the present arrangement is that it does give us, at any rate, a reasonable opportunity or possibility of revising again if and when we find that these proposals do or do not satisfy the demands that have been made.

There is another point in the speech of the Bishop of Durham as to which I should like to say a word, that is the amount of demand that is made for revision. It is always extraordinarily difficult to ascertain really what the Church wants, or how it intends to express any demand which it has on its mind. But I think that a lot of converging signs show that the Prayer Book as it stands does not satisfy the situation of the Church in the present day. I do not think that that can really be denied. I do not think that it is a purely clerical business : and though, of course, the laity have hardly learned to talk quite as much as we hope they will in the future, they have been very silent in the past. I have one special reason for knowing something about it, because after the National Mission the Archbishop of Canterbury asked me to be chairman of a Committee on the Worship of the Church. That was in the course of the war, and we were bombarded with all kinds of suggestions from all the chaplains who were at the Front. They agreed in wanting drastic changes, but not in the character of the changes proposed. Being thus bombarded, we thought it would be desirable to ascertain, as far as possible, how far their point of view was supported in England. So, through the kindness of the bishops, we were able to send a paper of questions round to the various dioceses, and we got a very large number of replies. There were one or two rural deaneries, I think, which did not reply ; but there were hardly any of the replies which were not in favour of a change, and there was a big list of changes which, if they were not unanimously desired, were supported by a large majority. Therefore, though things have changed a good deal since the middle period of the war, I think one can honestly say that there was a demand for changes of various kinds.

The Bishop of Durham suggests, I think, that we should postpone this one particular question upon which he is unable to support the Committee until we can establish courts to which people will agree. I think he is quite right, at any rate in the logical order. We do want a revision of the existing courts, and I do not think we shall have, so to speak, proper order and discipline in the Church until we have had such a revision. On all that ground I am with the Bishop of Durham ; but I would deprecate postponing any issue that is now raised until we can reach a decision on that particular point. We have been engaged for seventeen years upon producing the present N.A. 84, and I should think on a modest computation that we might be another seventeen years before we got Ecclesiastical Courts which would be satisfactory ; and the difficulty of finding out

whether they were satisfactory or not would largely turn on the very question which is raised by the proposals which are under discussion. Therefore, I should be perfectly contented if the inquiry into the Courts went on simultaneously with the process of dealing with this Report: but I should very much deprecate the suspension of the most important of the proposals which cause discussion and difference of opinion, until we can settle a matter so difficult and thorny as the question of the Courts.

I feel that the time that we have given to producing these suggestions is, perhaps, not over-long from some points of view. When I moved in the Lower House of the Southern Convocation the final Resolutions to send these suggestions, or the earlier draft of them, as our answer to the Letters of Business, I remember that it was in my mind that we had taken exactly as many years in producing 161 resolutions on the Prayer Book as those who were concerned in 1662 had taken months in producing a new Prayer Book; and although I hope that the enormously increased time that we have spent upon it will mean that our work is very much better than theirs, I am not sanguine that that will be the result. I have always thought that the Convocations were wrong in taking so long over it. They ought to have answered the Letters of Business very much more quickly, and I think one of the effects of their delay is that the entire lack of order and discipline, which we are all deploring now, has come into existence. Ever since the revision of the Prayer Book began to be discussed by the first Committee, people have felt thus: "The subject of the Prayer Book is under discussion, and we can do as we like until something new has happened." Therefore, if we postponed still further any vital question in regard to the Prayer Book, we should be worse off at the end rather than better in the direction of getting order and discipline in the Church again. Take, for instance, the one question of Reservation. If we postponed the consideration of that question for a number of years, we should find more and more people starting to reserve on all kinds of grounds, and we should find it more and more difficult to separate Reservation from the extra-liturgical cult of the Reserved Sacrament. I think we should be very much worse off by the time we got our Courts than we are now, and the fact that the Courts might conceivably attempt to suppress a number of things that had been developed while those Courts were being inaugurated would be all against their being successful.

Therefore, my Lords, while I should be very glad indeed to see the question of the Courts taken up, I do not want such a vital question as this to be postponed for so long as would be necessary to achieve a result in that direction.

May I now say one or two words about the whole question which was raised in the Bishop's speech? I should like to give the reasons why I am not anxious to reserve my vote against this particular point

which is now under discussion. I think that we tend—I hope this will not be thought wrong—to exaggerate the importance of the Anglo-Catholic Movement in one or two respects. It is, of course, a very important movement, and it has obtained a very large amount of support. The point on which the majority of us, I think, are inclined to criticise that movement is the point on which the Bishop of Durham laid his finger yesterday, namely, that it does practically deny the authority of the English Church to determine rites and ceremonies; that is to say, that we are confronted in regard to this particular point with a statement that we have no right to determine whether there shall be, or shall not be, the Reserved Sacrament in the Church. Sometimes we are told that we have no right to settle —I think the Bishop of Durham read a quotation from Dr. Darwell Stone in which this was practically implied—whether there should be the practice of Eucharistic Adoration apart from the service. Surely that line of thought will succeed in the Church only if it is ultimately capable of being defended on grounds of reason. I do not think that we can look forward, or that we ought to look forward, to a view which is radically unsound on grounds of evidence and reason dominating the Church altogether. Certain persons may from time to time be attracted by it. It may have vogue in certain ways. But I do not think we ought easily to assume that, unless we take exceptional measures, this point of view, whether it is right or not on grounds of reason, will ultimately become dominant. I would venture to suggest that its chances of becoming dominant, if it depends on grounds of reason and evidence, are extraordinarily small.

There are two points on which I might say a word. Both of them are put forward with great emphasis on that side. One of them is the view that the Ornaments Rubric, when it talks of the second year of King Edward VI., does not refer to the Prayer Book but to the system of things which went on before: and that by that means all sorts of things like incense and various other matters are legalised actually by the Ornaments Rubric. I have been told that these matters are not now matters of opinion, but are matters of legal obligation, and that persons who do not follow that use are out of contact with the actual law. About twenty years ago—I forget the actual date—there was a hearing at Lambeth on the subject of incense, and Mr. Dibdin (now Sir Lewis Dibdin) delivered a criticism of that interpretation of the rubric which is the most destructive thing that I think I have ever come across in all my reading. He showed that Mr. Micklethwaite, who I think had originated it, had made two quite pardonable blunders, but very bad blunders, and he produced a series of facts any one of which was incompatible with the interpretation. I do not mean to say that Sir Lewis introduced another interpretation, but he produced a number of facts any one of which

absolutely destroyed the theory as it was set out. That has been before the public for twenty years, and I very much regret that anybody should say any longer, unless he is prepared to overthrow the arguments of Sir Lewis Dibdin, that there is anything to be said for that interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric. I have some acquaintance with historical investigations, and I am quite sure that in ordinary scholarship, if people went on proclaiming a theory which had been so disastrously exposed as that particular theory, they would not be able to avoid extremely unfavourable comment as to their competence or sincerity in dealing with the question. Therefore that ought to go; and I cannot conceive that anything that rests upon that argument can possibly stand investigation.

The other point—which again I think cannot be sustained—is the statement that we must approve and use what was approved and used before the schisms of the East and West. There is more to be said for that point than there is for the other, because it is not so much a matter of fact as a matter of the conception of the Church that is involved in it. At the same time it seems to me quite hopeless to suppose that the Church, either here or in Rome or in Constantinople, is or can be absolutely bound for ever by determinations taken under different circumstances, in wholly different situations, with different kinds of people, different levels of education, and different interests of every conceivable kind. I am sure that the Church does not go on building up a binding tradition of hard unmanageable rules, which force it against any conceivable kind of change in outward circumstances. Therefore, whatever you may say on grounds of propriety and so on, I do not think it is conceivable that any Church on earth can accept that principle. I feel that this contention comes from using what I might call shorthand in our conversation about these matters. You might say, for instance, that we hold the Nicene Creed because the Nicene Council approved it. That is roughly true; but it is an abstract statement of the fact. Those of us who hold the Nicene Creed believe that it is capable of defence on its own grounds now; some arguments which were used for the Creed at the time of the Nicene Council may not still hold, and we have to find a new set now. But we do not for one moment imagine that because the Nicene Council passed the Creed in any particular form, therefore, and for that reason only, it is binding absolutely upon all persons who accept it. We never can separate the tradition of authority from its ultimate reason, and that is what it seems to me this particular principle does.

There is one other thing that I should like to add on that. I do not think that any large body, the State, or the Church, can be governed except by principles capable of rational defence. Such a body draws in new ideas from various sources as it goes on with its experience; some of those ideas are capable of being

defended, and some are not; as it goes on through the world it throws off from time to time those things which it can no longer hold, and that process must be continuous: it is impossible to shut it down at any particular date.

There are two small points that I want to make before I sit down. One is that any attempt at putting the case of the Church on mere dated authority is impossible the moment you begin to talk of re-union. The moment you begin to talk of re-union, you have to consider a situation in which a variety of bodies are in a state of schism. Everybody knows when this, that and the other opinion was first held, who held it, and so on; and if once you rest your case for re-union, or for the discussion of re-union, on such considerations as that, you will never get any further. What you must do if you are going to try to re-unite is to see where it was, and why it was, that the various bodies diverged. When you have done that, and when you have clearly understood what was the common point out of which the divergence arose, then there is some reasonable chance of getting the question of re-union seriously considered. But unless you can do that, that is to say, unless you go right behind all that kind of argument with which we are confronted now as against the Prayer Book, there is no chance whatever of our getting out of our present difficulties.

The other point that I want just to deal with for a moment is perhaps a more theological one. I think that the Tractarians did us a great service by bringing back into the active thought of the Church the doctrine of the Incarnation and all that it means in explaining the method of Christ's Revelation to the world. They were quite right in closely connecting the Church — in fact, they followed very largely, I suppose, the Epistle to the Ephesians—with the Body of the Lord. But I think it is quite possible, in emphasising that, to fail to lay sufficient stress on the mission of the Holy Spirit, and I cannot help thinking that our problem in the immediate future is the recovery, somewhat in the way that the Tractarians recovered the doctrine of the Incarnation, of the idea of the Spirit living in and operating and guiding the present Church. ("Hear, hear.") For many years I had the great privilege of being chaplain to Bishop Westcott, who was very much impressed by, and constantly called our attention and the attention of his ordination candidates to, a statement in one of Bishop Thirlwall's Essays. I cannot give you the reference to it; but the statement was to the effect that the problem of the age that was to come was to clear up and define the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. I am perfectly sure that that is what we want, especially in regard to all these questions which are now before us, because we need not go further than the 16th chapter of the Gospel of S. John in order to remind ourselves that our Lord definitely implied that the coming of the Holy Spirit meant an advance, in some sense, on His own

mission in the world. "For if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." There is a sense in which the Church as a vehicle of the revelation of the Holy Spirit is what we have to meditate over, to understand, and to realise more in practice than we have done in the past; and I feel, and I hope, that all these discussions will force it forward.

As I said at the beginning, I propose, as at present advised, to vote for these proposals, and I hope that when the discussion comes it will be based upon really rational and theological grounds, so that we shall know exactly where we are, and why it is we vote in one way or the other. For my own part, I think that by moving that Reservation should be restricted absolutely to the use of the sick, and indirectly (and I hope successfully) ruling out the ordinary extra-liturgical cult of the Blessed Sacrament, we have drawn the line exactly where we are theologically justified in drawing it; and not only theologically justified, but historically justified, and where I think we can most boldly face the question as to how it is that the Holy Spirit guides the Church.

The Archbishop of York: My Lords,—I think in this session we are all aware of the difficulty imposed upon us by the Standing Orders of the Assembly of which we are a part. We know that we cannot enter upon our own stage of revision until both the other Houses have completed theirs. Therefore it is impossible for us to commit ourselves now to decisions which it may be necessary to reconsider at a later stage. But it is, I think, fitting that both the other Houses, and indeed the Church in general, as we embark upon this most momentous enterprise, should learn from the members of this House what they think about the larger questions of policy which are involved. I intervene in the discussion at this moment because I wish to make a mere suggestion, which possibly it may be well for those who follow to bear in mind.

I want to say, first of all, one word of a preliminary kind. Since this draft left the hands of Convocation and entered into the hands of the National Assembly, public attention has naturally been focussed upon certain outstanding points, and I think in consequence that there is some danger lest the great mass of the work so laboriously done by Convocation during these seventeen years should be forgotten. ("Hear, hear.") The great bulk of that work was really uncontroversial, and most valuable; the work, I mean, of adapting rubrics to existing circumstances, and removing obscurities and ambiguities of language, and of enriching the Prayer Book with additions which are universally desired. I am sure that the House of Clergy, when it addresses itself to revision, will remember that in another capacity it consists of the members of the Lower Houses of Convocation, and will observe that principle of continuity without which the work of Convocation is almost

impossible. I venture to add that I am sure that the House of Laity, which is new to these discussions, will give a fair and generous deference to the labours of Convocation, and will, so far as possible, confine their discussions to matters in which large questions of principle are involved.

After all, my Lords, I think we sometimes forget that the persons whom we ought to have most in our minds are the parish priests and their people in the parishes of the country; that what they desire is that they shall be able to offer to God a worship which is intelligible and edifying to the people, and to know that in so doing they have behind them the authority of the whole Church to which they belong. But there are one or two matters which I think call now for reconsideration, and I wish to speak this morning about only one of them, and that is the question of the Order of Holy Communion—a question which, just because it touches the deepest convictions and associations of men's minds and hearts, is also apt to be the most controversial. I think it is not a point of detail unsuitable to this stage of our discussions, because very possibly on our attitude towards this matter the attitude of the whole Church towards the revision of the Prayer Book may largely depend.

Here I must remind your Lordships of the position which has been taken in this matter by the Convocation of York. As your Grace reminded us, the answers of the Convocations to the Letters of Business were substantially identical; but in one most important respect the answer of the Convocation of York differed from that of the Convocation of Canterbury. In the answer of the Convocation of York there was no recommendation of any change in the structure or sequence of the Order of Holy Communion. That decision was reached for two somewhat different reasons. In the first place, there were many in the Upper House who strongly objected to any permissive change in the Order of Holy Communion at all. Perhaps the most able and persistent advocate of no permissive change was the late Bishop of Manchester, whose voice has reached us in the form of an open letter which he has addressed to this House; and I am sure that we shall give to that letter the weight which is due to the affection we all have for the personality of Bishop Knox, and the admiration we feel for his great ability and his unswerving consistency. ("Hear, hear.")

But there was another reason, which was held by myself and by, I think, a majority of the Lower House. It was this: We thought that the proposals of the Convocation of Canterbury were certain to antagonise those who desired no change whatever, and yet were in themselves so meagre and unsatisfactory from a liturgical point of view that they would not give any satisfaction to those who desired permission for some change. ("Hear, hear.") What we, therefore, asked ourselves was this: Would it not be better, rather than disturb

the existing order by these somewhat meagre proposals, to wait until a time had come when, with larger liturgical knowledge and greater charity, it might be possible to secure, as an alternative rite, some fuller liturgy, such as the First Prayer Book of 1549? What I venture to ask this House, and (so far as it is permissible) the other Houses, is the question whether that time has not now come? Let me at once say this about my own feeling in the matter. I think it is difficult to exaggerate the loss to the Church of England of one rite of the Holy Communion, in which all its members everywhere may join together. Personally I cannot fail to be content with a rite which has satisfied Cosin and Wilson, Venn and Moule, Westcott and Maurice, Pusey and Keble, and Liddon, Church and King. But we have to face the facts, and, for reasons upon which it is needless for me to enlarge, there has grown up a very strong desire for a liturgy more consonant with the main stream of the liturgical traditions of the Church. The result is, whether we like it or not, a very general dissatisfaction culminating in a certain restlessness, and, what is far worse, in the introduction of many unauthorised interpolations and additions to the existing rite.

But I do not think it is very helpful merely to deplore the symptoms. I think we have to try to get at the source of the trouble and to ask ourselves whether it might not be possible to authorise the use of a rite which would meet the wish for a fuller and richer liturgy, and would arouse the loyalty which would support authority in forbidding other and unauthorised uses.

Turning to the suggestions of the Committee, they are many and admirable: but, without elaborating the point, I think it is obvious that these things have to be said about them—namely, they will certainly not satisfy those who desire no permissive change in the Order of Holy Communion; and they will equally not satisfy those who desire that such a change should be permitted. To put it in a sentence, they will distress those who object to any permissive change, and will not satisfy those who desire it. What I suggest—I do not do more—is that this House and the other Houses in discussing these matters should have in mind the possibility of permitting a change, if any change is to be permitted, which would bring a real liturgical gain, and a real prospect of meeting the wish of those who desire an alternative rite; and further, whether this end would not best be met by frankly permitting the restoration of the Order of the First Prayer Book of 1549. I cannot say, I do not think anyone could say, that that Order is incapable of amendment or improvement. It was drawn up in circumstances of great haste. Since then there has been a great advance in liturgical knowledge, and I think that in some respects, here and there, amendment of the Order would be desirable. I must confess that I do not find any very helpful amendments in the Order which has been placed before us unofficially, with a foreword from the present Bishop of Manchester. I

have studied it, but frankly I think it means a great disturbance of our existing Order, without that liturgical strength and dignity which belongs to the Order of 1549.

I would say, and say frankly, that I think that some, at least, of the suggestions made in the Report which has been published by the English Church Union deserve the sympathetic consideration of this and the other Houses. But my point is that we should ask ourselves the question whether, if we are to have any alternative rite at all, it ought not to be a rite substantially identical with that of 1549. Now, here I would commend the suggestion to your attention by asking one or two questions. In the first place, would not this be a real liturgical enrichment of our Prayer Book? I certainly think that the Order of 1549 is far more consonant with primitive models and the great stream of liturgical tradition than are the proposals made by the Committee. The Order of 1549 emphasises our continuity of worship with other ages of the Church, and our community of worship with those Churches which, like ourselves, value the great liturgical traditions of the Church. In the second place, is it not in accordance with the mind and teaching of the Church of England as both Reformed and Catholic? ("Hear, hear.") Let us remember that it was the first achievement of the Reformation. I need not remind your Lordships that, in the very Act of Uniformity enforcing the Second Prayer Book, it was said of the First Prayer Book that it was a very godly Order and agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church—the two standards of the teaching of the Church of England.

May I also remind your Lordships, if it is necessary to do so, that it lays down that great and vital truth upon which is based the teaching of the Church of England with regard to the element of sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist; I mean the sufficiency and finality of our Lord's sacrifice upon the Cross, in the familiar words which are not in the Roman Catholic rite: "Who made there by His one oblation, once offered, a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." As a matter of fact—and perhaps it is worth adding—the doctrinal objections to the First Prayer Book are mainly directed against the Canon, and, therefore, would be equally directed against the present proposals of the Committee: indeed, I think it is true that the objections might be greater against the present suggestions of the Committee than they would be against the Order of 1549. Thus, I notice that Bishop Knox in his letter says that from the alternative proposed to the National Assembly there have disappeared not only the words in the Invocation: "That the bread and wine may be unto us the Body and Blood of Christ," upon which Cranmer relied; but also all reference to the memorial that Christ willed and commanded to be made. Both of those great and significant phrases are to be found in the Order of 1549.

What I ask that we should remember is that this Order is a legacy of the Reformation, coming to us from the time in that great movement which was most full of promise, before the increasing tumult, bitterness and violence of later times. Again, I need not remind this House that this permissive restoration would be no new step in the life of the Anglican Communion. It is already the basis of the Prayer Book of the Episcopal Church in the United States, and of the alternative which has been long permitted in the Scottish Church and is now permitted in the South African Church. I do not think that there is any reality in saying that any principle vital to the history and character of the Church of England would be set aside if its children were permitted to use an Order which, in one form or another, is used by their brethren with whom they are in communion in other lands.

Then thirdly I ask, Is there not a good hope that this permissive restoration would satisfy the great majority of those who desire a permissive change, and might it not bring a new and welcome day of loyalty and order within the Church of England? Here, my Lords, I must notice the characteristically forcible and incisive speech of the Bishop of Durham, to which we listened yesterday afternoon. With much that he said there must needs be agreement. The licence in public worship which now prevails in many quarters has passed the limits of what is tolerable, or consistent with the self-respect of the Church. ("Hear, hear.") No doubt it is partly due to the varied rulings of individual bishops, rendered almost inevitable by the abeyance of any Ecclesiastical Courts, for the reasons sufficiently given by the Royal Commission. To that I will return in a moment, if there is time. No doubt it is partly due to that very pressure of the religious life of the people against the barriers of uniformity, which the whole movement for Prayer Book revision tries to relieve. But it is also due, be it said frankly, to a spirit of lawlessness and self-will, which is bad for the nation, bad for the Church, and bad, I will add, for the spiritual life of those who yield to it. ("Hear, hear.")

But I think it would be most unjust to involve the whole influential and devoted movement within our Church which has taken the title of "Anglo-Catholic" in the condemnation of these extremists, however active and vocal they may be. That, I think, was the main defect of the Bishop of Durham's speech. The mistake, if I may venture so to describe it, which he makes has many parallels. In our own day it has not only a parallel but a very close analogy in the mistake of those who identify the revolutionary language of some of the members of the Labour Movement with the movement as a whole. It is very easy for anyone to read extracts from wild and whirling speeches and writings; but it would be most unjust to regard these statements as characteristic or representative of the movement as a whole. No

doubt we desire that the great bulk of the Labour Movement should dissociate itself more actively from the opinions of its extremer members. But this is the point to note: Undiscriminating attack from without always provokes undiscriminating defence from within; and, surely, the way of justice, and the way which is most likely to deprive the extremists of their influence, is to recognise that the majority have no desire for revolution, and to agree that they have, whether we agree with their opinions or not, a rightful place in the life of the community.

So is it, I think, in the life of the Church of England to-day. I do not think it is unfair to say that the implication of the Bishop of Durham's speech was that the whole Anglo-Catholic Movement is disloyal to the Church of England.

THE BISHOP OF DURHAM: I think it is important that I should, at once, correct that impression. What I did was to point out that we were not concerned with mere irresponsible individuals, but with large bodies, of a thousand at once, who pledged themselves publicly in a memorial to the bishops that they would disobey.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK: I must leave the House to draw its own inference from the Bishop's speech; but, whether my interpretation of it is right or wrong, if that implication were to be the basis of policy, what would be the consequence? We should not divide or destroy the movement. It is too deep-seated and firmly rooted. What we should do would be simply to make it increasingly aggressive and militant, and in such an atmosphere the influence of these extremists would not be broken, but strengthened. To brand the whole movement as disloyal is the surest way of making it disloyal. We do indeed desire that its really loyal members would dissociate themselves more conspicuously from the statements of its extremer members. But loyalty is engendered and encouraged, not by suspicion, but by trust. Is it not the better way to appeal to that loyalty as something which is already there, and to acknowledge those who call themselves Anglo-Catholics as having a place of their own in the life of the Church?

What I ask, then—and I only ask it—is this: Would not the offer of an alternative Order of Holy Communion in accordance with the First Prayer Book be such as would appeal to loyalty, and would not there be the growth and spread of loyalty in response? There are other proposals before the Assembly, which I think would have the same character and effect, such as the permissive use of vestments and the permissive use of Reservation of the Sacrament for the purpose of communicating the sick and the dying. I do not speak of these: I only wish to keep to one point, and to ask at this stage—and please understand that at this stage I cannot do more, and do not do more than ask the question—if any change in the Order of

Holy Communion is to be made, ought it not to be the permissive use of the Order of 1549?

There are two things which I must add. The first is that it remains to be seen how far this suggestion would really win the support of those of whom I have spoken. There will be time before this House reaches the stage of Revision to discover that from the proceedings in the other House, or from the platform, the Press, and pamphlets. I would venture to make an appeal to the great body of those who sympathise with the Anglo-Catholic Movement to let it be seen whether or no they would be prepared to rally round such an offer as this as a call to more definite loyalty to the authority of the Church of England. If the suggestion fails to win support, or wins a support so qualified as to be unreal, then the suggestion misses the main part of its purpose. It would be superfluous to press for a change that nobody seems to desire.

Secondly, in any event, after Prayer Book revision has been completed other unauthorised uses must be made to cease. We must set ourselves to a real effort to restore the principles of order and authority within the Church of England. It may be, though I trust not, that this would mean recourse to the Ecclesiastical Courts; and here I would refer to the other part of the Bishop of Durham's speech. There again, there must needs be large agreement on what he said. The present position, as I have indicated, is really not tolerable. It is a position in which, over a large tract of matters ecclesiastical, the Ecclesiastical Courts have ceased to function for the reasons given in the report of the Royal Commission. The result is not merely a licence which is a perversion of liberty, but, what is worse, the loss of the whole conception of law as an essential moral principle in the life of the community. There are many who think that the reform of the Courts ought to have preceded the revision of the Prayer Book. Possibly there may be an advantage that reasonable liberty should be first secured; but once that has been done, I agree respectfully with the Royal Commission and with the Bishop of Durham that the reform of the Courts is a corollary of the revision of the Prayer Book. Where I differ from the Bishop is as to the stage at which this formidable task should be begun: and there I associate myself with what has been said by the Bishop of Ripon. As I understand it, the Bishop of Durham proposes that certain large and more controversial matters should be deferred until the task of reforming the Ecclesiastical Courts has been carried through. I would urge, on the contrary, that every effort should first be made to complete a reasonable and generous revision; for I hope that the goodwill thus created would greatly ease the solution of the thorny problem of the Courts. The Bishop's proposal, I think, would have the reverse effect.

We have to remember, as has been pointed out by the Bishop of Ripon, that these more controversial matters which the Bishop of

Durham would defer are just those on which the Courts would be most likely to be invoked. His proposal, if he will forgive me for putting it into homely language, is practically this: "We will not tell you what is to be done on these matters, but we will now prepare the stick which will beat you into obedience to our decisions, whatever they may be." Surely, at the very outset of the enterprise, that is to provoke suspicion and antagonism. Yet remember, my Lords, that there is no chance of accomplishing the reform of the Courts, or of winning the assent of conscience to their jurisdiction, without the co-operation of all parties, and not least of the party which the Bishop suspects. I submit that the wiser and more hopeful plan is first to achieve, if possible, the revision of rubric and service which will meet such wishes of that section of the Church as are reasonable and consistent with the spirit and teaching of the Church of England. Then the temper of loyalty, which would thus be encouraged, if our hope proves to be well founded, would be of the utmost value in the approach to the difficult question of the Courts.

I apologise for having kept your Lordships so long. I will only add this on the general subject which is before us. No one, I think, can view the prospect of some years at least of variety, and it may be of confusion, in the public services of the Church without many regrets and some fears. I frankly voice my own regret that there should be for any period of time a variation in that rite which for 260 years has united the Church of England in its greatest act of worship, and has gathered round it memories so hallowed and associations so deep. Yet it seems that we are compelled by the very strength of the religious life in the Church to face the prospect of such a time, and the process, however difficult, if carried through with mutual generosity and charity may turn to good. If our vision of a reunited Church were ever to bear fruit, we should have to accustom ourselves to finding room within its borders for many varied customs of worship. It may be well that members of the Church of England, if I may use the words of one of the Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference, should have time in which to cultivate that temper of charity and understanding which is required of the members of so great and inclusive a society as the Church of Christ ought to be.

Lastly, it cannot be too often insisted upon that behind the proposals which are in this Measure there stands no new Act of Uniformity. There would be no compulsion. Those who wish for no change in the old accustomed Order may keep it as it stands. All that we ask is that such liberty should be given as is consistent with the limits, very wide but very real, set by the history of the Church of England and its place in the Church of Christ.

The Bishop of Ely: I do not think I should feel quite happy,

looking back upon this meeting, if I did not ask for an opportunity to say a few words in the most earnest support of the Resolution giving General Approval to this Measure, and then indicate briefly some of the conditions which I myself should attach to that Resolution. I think it is very likely that you will say that my observations are trite and commonplace. At the same time, I cannot but think that they are important. First of all, I would plead on behalf of General Approval the fact that these proposals are the result of protracted deliberations. An inconceivable amount of time and thought and spiritual energy has been devoted to them. I am one of those who have had a part in Prayer Book revision from the very first, until it passed into the hands of the Committee of the Assembly, and I can testify personally to the extreme care, to the extreme pains, which have been called out in this great effort. It seems to me that it is almost unthinkable that the Church should cast aside, unconsidered in detail, the result of all these accumulated labours.

In the second place I would plead the claim of those who are placed in positions of administration and government. Many people twenty years ago were impatient with the rubrics as antiquated relics of the past, and hence with something like tacit consent they were neglected. The general public, whether clergy or laity, could be content with this *modus vivendi*, but it could hardly be so with those who were called on to administer the affairs of the Church. For if a bishop's rule is to be respected, it must be consistent. He cannot to-day sanction disobedience to rubrics and to-morrow enforce obedience to rubrics. Hence there was seen to be an imperative need of revision. The rubrics must be made clear in meaning and possible of observance. ("Hear, hear.") This difficulty is still with us, but it has been vastly aggravated; for this revision, as we have been reminded, has been going on for seventeen years. The recommendations of Convocation have been published to the clergy and to the laity. If no final legal authority attaches to them, yet they have a moral and spiritual force; and of course it has been inevitable that many have acted on them in our parish churches. Speaking for myself, in my own diocese I have at least tried to keep within limits this anticipation of full authorisation; but perhaps some of my brethren among the bishops have been more lax or more liberal. At any rate, it seems to me we have reached a condition of things dangerously irregular. Provisions of the Prayer Book, to obedience to which we have solemnly pledged ourselves, are widely disobeyed and other directions allowed to replace them. Now this habit of neglect of rules and of independence rapidly becomes far too familiar, and spreads from things essentially small to things essentially great; and the result is morally bad. Therefore, it is essential that there should be a recognised revision of the Prayer Book, so that the conditions of worship should be made clear, stable, and ethically sound.

In the third place, I would point to the large principle of healthy historical continuity and development. The Church's manual of devotion ought to be in close living relation to the present mind of the Church, and the present mind of the people. Common-sense is not it so?—demands that at no distant intervals there should be a revision of the Prayer Book. Two hundred and sixty years have passed since the last revision. The Church and the people are not in any sense the same in feeling, custom and thought as when the excitement of the Restoration of Charles II. was still fresh and active.

Now the result of this long absence of revision is twofold. On the one hand the Prayer Book has become a fetish: it seems almost impossible to change what has so long remained unchanged. Revision to many minds is an almost impious thing. On the other hand, parts of the Prayer Book, in the minds of many, have become mere antiquated relics only fit for an Ecclesiastical Museum. And perhaps the worse of it all is, such is the waywardness of the human mind, that these two lines of thought have coalesced. Those who have been strongest in deprecation of revision have been most active and most unabashed in what I would call private revision; and thus the whole atmosphere of Church life has tended to become vitiated and unnatural. There are other reasons on which I could dwell, showing the imperative necessity for a revision; but I will base my desire for General Approval on those three grounds: the time and thought spent over the work; the unfair position in which those are placed who have to bear the heavy burden of administration and government: the inherent necessity of periodic change if the life of the Church is to be healthy. So with all the earnestness of which I am capable I urge the General Approval of this Measure so that it may be taken into detailed consideration.

But, my Lords, I could not urge this course unless I went on to indicate directions in which, as it seems to me, we are bound to exercise vigilant caution and care before we give the stamp of approval to the detailed proposals of the Measure. The Committee of the Assembly has, as we all feel, put us under the greatest obligation by their earnestness, by their diligence, and by their resourcefulness. The fact that my dear brother and friend Bishop Gibson took the lead in this work is its greatest commendation to me. But I should not be quite true to myself if I did not frankly say that, if this Committee has added many elements of interest to the work of revision, it has also added, I think, new grounds for anxiety. We must, moreover, bear in mind that there are clear indications that further amendments will come before us when we discuss these matters in detail. I shall be studiously general in what I now go on to say. I shall purposely abstain from alluding to particular proposals. I am only concerned now with principles.

The first principle is that we must zealously maintain the simplicity of the Prayer Book. One of the chief reasons, surely

why the Prayer Book for nearly four centuries has maintained its position and won the respect of the English people lies in its largeness of view, its sanity, and its simplicity. Broadly speaking, it does not waste its strength in multiplicity and minuteness of ceremonial. It is not fussy. Broadly speaking, the language of the Prayer Book is chaste, massive, dignified, never stilted or involved. It does not lose itself in elaborate metaphors. Now one of our most essential duties in this proposed revision is to maintain those priceless characteristics of the Prayer Book which I gather up in that one word "simplicity." We must bear in mind that the Prayer Book has sacred and close relations, not only to those Church people who are something of experts in ecclesiastical customs and in ecclesiastical traditions, but to the multitudes of ordinary untrained folk, often the most serious and most devout people, such as I find in the country villages of my rural diocese—and I would add emphatically it bears close relations to the whole English people. We are a National Church. I would venture to submit that the obligation of care in this matter becomes more obvious and more important when we take into account those practical hopes of some real measure of re-union with good Christian people who at present, largely through our own fault, stand outside our Communion. In view of all this, I am sure that I do not set too high a value on the simplicity of the Prayer Book and our duty of maintaining it.

The next matter is the stress which I would venture to lay on the maintaining of a reasonable measure of uniformity. We all remember that great sentence of Cranmer in the preface to the Prayer Book of 1549: "And whereas heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in churches within this realm, now from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use." I am perfectly willing to allow that the application of this principle of uniformity in the past has sometimes been unsympathetic, mechanical, and rigid; but the principle itself is sound and good, and it has supplied a power of cohesion to the Church of England which I think we do not sufficiently recognise. ("Question.") Here I feel that I must ask for the indulgence of my brethren. With my whole soul I deplore that principle of revision which was adopted by the Convocation of Canterbury in the February of 1915. I mean this:—

> That it is not desirable to introduce into the text of the Book of Common Prayer any of the changes recommended, but the changes and additions should be embodied in another volume to be sanctioned by authority for optional use for a period hereafter to be determined.

It seemed to me then, and it seems to me now, that this proposal in effect sets up two rival Prayer Books, with all the consequent permutations and combinations, and thereby inaugurates a period of liturgical contention, conflict, and controversy; the battlefield in which these two rival Prayer Books must strive for the

mastery the one over the over being the very worship of the Church. I tried to speak earnestly against that proposal. I suggested an amendment. I think, if I might venture to say so, that that debate —I believe it was on the 10th February, 1915—is well worth your reading if you desire to understand the conditions of revision. But my convictions have been strengthened by what has happened since then. In February, 1915, some eight years had passed since the revision began. Now eight years more have elapsed, and still the Church is asked to confess that it cannot make up its mind to definite proposals of revision in the Prayer Book itself. Everything is to be still tentative, provisional, and, forgive me for saying, chaotic. Again, the ensuing confusion seemed serious enough when matters of minor liturgical importance were concerned; but since 1915 the new Canon in the office of the Holy Communion has been put forward, so that now we have to fear that the confusion of rival uses will extend to the deepest things of Christian worship.

But perhaps you will say to me, "If you feel thus, why not raise the question anew?" I think the answer is plain. It seemed to me then, and it seems to me now, that the principle of alternative Books became, by that Resolution, a condition on which the work of revision went forward, and, therefore, it can hardly now be reversed. We all sometimes have to acknowlege that a decision which we deeply deplore cannot be recalled. All we can do is to minimise the evils of the decision, and to take measures that they shall not spread. That is why I have referred to this critical episode in the history of revision. For I think no one can study the proposals for revision in the Report and doubt that since 1915 the fashion of alternatives in worship has advanced greatly. Sometimes, in a pessimistic mood, I have felt that when the proposals for revision work out in practice there will be a perfect orgy of alternatives. And, as I have already said, other proposals are sure to come before us in this same direction, for an alternative always relieves us from the strain of making up our minds, and for a moment it gives a mild satisfaction to both parties. I have seen it suggested that to the Holy Communion office in the Prayer Book and the Holy Communion office in the Committee's Report there should be added the Holy Communion office as suggested in the pamphlet of the English Church Union, and that each should be sanctioned; so that, to use the current terms which we so much dislike, the Evangelicals, the Anglicans and the Catholics should each have their own particular rite. Am I wrong when I say emphatically, "Beware! keep within bounds this alluring principle of alternatives."

Again, we must jealously maintain loyalty to the essential character of the Church of England. I think that all that is most hopeful in the work which we trust that the Church of England will accomplish in Christendom in the years to come, as mediator and as reconciler, depends on the fact that historically and essentially it is

a reformed branch of the Catholic Church. We rejoice in our possession of the epithet "Catholic" in no partisan sense. We rejoice in our possession of the epithet "Reformed," again in no partisan sense. We must maintain both elements of our inheritance, in full reality and fidelity to the historical character of the Church of England, as the ideal and practical standard which in this work of revision we must ever have before our eyes. And in particular, I will add, as to the great and fundamental question of porportion in teaching and in the symbolism of worship, we must have it always printed in our remembrance that the New Testament is the ultimate rule and the ultimate guide. This seems to me the very heart and core of the Church's doctrine and discipline.

One further element in our duty at this time I will mention, and I am thankful that it has had a conspicuous place in many of the speeches that we have listened to. The brevity with which I now treat it is in complete antithesis to the importance which I attach to it. We cannot but acknowledge that forces, which I will gently call disintegrating forces, are very active around us. We must honestly acknowledge and face that situation. It rests with this generation to see to it that the Revised Prayer Book preserves a true purity of doctrine and a true purity of worship. It will rest with this generation, perhaps even more with the next generation, to see that the provisions and the directions on which the Church sets the seal of its authority are recognised and obeyed. Therefore it seems to me there is nothing more clear or more imperative than that the authorities of the Church of England should immediately take in hand the reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts, a work I believe long overdue. Of course it is a task of overwhelming difficulty, but to shrink from it any longer would seem, to me at least, faithless. Under the new conditions of the rules of worship to which this revision will lead, it must be possible, if the Church is in any true sense to survive as a corporate body, to obtain decisions as to what is lawful and what is not lawful which shall be generally respected and obeyed. I would observe that unless this reform, for which there seems to be a great sense of need, follows closely upon the work of Prayer Book revision, unauthorised practices will grow up and take root in this new condition of things, and when once they have taken root it will be extraordinarily difficult—we know this from sad experience—even with clear decisions of respected Courts to restrain and to correct them. Depend upon it, judicial reform must give reality and stability to liturgical reform. We must reaffirm and learn afresh the sacredness of law. It is because I believe that these reforms will be fulfilled in our subsequent work of revision that with all my heart I support the motion for General Approval of this Measure.

The Bishop of Norwich: Your Grace, I have nothing very fresh or learned to contribute to this debate. I only ask that my

words may be regarded as those of common-sense and independent judgment. At any rate I may claim that I shall add a certain variety to the debate, because I am one of those who do not propose to support the Resolution. If I wanted to be very brief, and I think we all should be brief, I should ask that my argument might be taken direct from most of the speeches that we have already heard. Under the Standing Orders it was made perfectly plain by his Grace that it was impossible for us to deal with this Measure otherwise than as a whole. I do not for a moment quarrel with this, but it leads me to say that with very great regret I have to vote against this Measure as a whole. The Bishop of Chichester, with his beautiful lucidity, as usual, made clear to us exactly what the position is. When he gave us the nine points that were non-contentious, I think I would have voted for every one of them with both hands. Then he turned later to the eight points that were contentious, and he himself felt that they needed some fresh discussion. As the debate has gone on I have been interested to find that almost every bishop who has spoken has said, "I am going to vote for General Approval, *but* it is only on the understanding that radical changes are made in the Measure when it comes before the House." I suppose that the Holy Communion Office and the rubrics connected with it are the most important parts of the new Prayer Book. Years ago in Convocation, when I first began to speak about these things, I used to say two things: that I did hope whatever might happen we might all have one Order of the Holy Communion; and that that one Order might be the one that is in our Prayer Book. As I look back ten years ago—I think it was something like that—I remember I used to speak with the majority of the bishops surrounding me; then they got fewer; then they dribbled away and became fewer still; and now I am afraid to-day that I speak as Cassandra. But I am not ashamed of my own perfect consistency through the matter, and I am only sorry to think that, whereas I used to be in a glorious majority, I am now in a contemptible minority. But I cannot believe that in the service of Holy Communion alternatives have any place—("Hear, Hear").—and it grated on my ears more than I can say when I heard the Bishop of Truro say yesterday that we ought to approach the Lord in that service in "schools of thought." How can we approach the Lord in schools of thought at a supreme moment of that kind? Are we not bound to approach in a unity of worship, if our worship is to be acceptable in the heavenly places? These schools of thought that take so large a place on earth—— Oh, what can they seem like at the Throne of God?

Then I do not believe that this alteration of the Communion Office was ever intended when first the Prayer Book revision was undertaken; it has only come to the front as the years have gone on. As to the rubrics about Reservation which were put into the

tentative Prayer Book by Convocation—and I seem to hear Bishop Paget's clear voice as he worded some of them for us—those rubrics that were put into the Prayer Book years and years ago have been altogether outrun and left behind. It appears to me that it is the fastest here who set the pace, and I cannot follow the Bishop of Ripon when he says that in a matter of this kind judgment always survives in the end. I have no kind of wish to say anything against the great Communion of the Church of Rome, but could we honestly say that judgment has been the ruling feature in the development of the Church of Rome? I wish I could.

I have watched the way these things have gone ahead, and I cannot believe that there is any guarantee that the greater liberty now allowed under the proposed Prayer Book will have more of a restraining influence than the liberty that was allowed first some ten years ago; because you will observe that this Report of the National Assembly does definitely go forward and offer more in the way of Reservation than did the previous rubrics at which we arrived. If it has been amply demonstrated in the last ten years that advanced rubrics, as they then were, have had no hold on those who wish to go beyond them, is it likely that more advanced rubrics will have a greater hold, when some think they too are inadequate?

Any alternative scheme for the Holy Communion seems to me out of place, and this particular scheme, in my humble opinion, appears so unsatisfactory, that if the choice lies, as it does to-day, between having an alternative Prayer Book, so far as we know containing the things that are in this Report, and having no change at all, then I am sorry to say I should prefer to keep the Prayer Book as it is. How can I tell what is going to survive, when we get to Revision, and what is not going to survive, what is going to be improved, and what is going to be made worse? I quite understand those who say, "Alas! to think that so much good work should be done away with." But now for the first time we are really in a position to review what the whole thing means. Perhaps I might remind your Lordships of the words of Tacitus—I must tone him down—where he points out that it is only when something has been done that the grave implications of it are fully realised; they are not apprehended while the work is in progress. I think it is very doubtful whether honoured and devout Churchmen would in many places accept this Book, unless it was expunged as most of the previous speakers seem to wish it to be expunged.

I confess that I am never much moved by what always appears to me a very irrelevant and rather weak argument, that in the Service of the Holy Communion we are largely following what is allowed in the Scottish Prayer Book. The Prayer Book of the Church of England in Scotland is not the Prayer Book of the Church of the people, and it appeals much more to the rather expert member of the Church than our Prayer Book does. There

are very many other things which may be said. I think the Bishop of Ely has said them so very much better than I have already said them that I will hurry on. It is said truly that alternative uses in the Reservation rubrics will tend to introduce that very element of instability and uncertainty which our earliest fixed Prayer Book was formed to remove. It is not as if we were being asked to compose a first English Prayer Book: our work is the work of revision. It is not as if we were asked to provide an alternative for a discredited Prayer Book. Some of us are extremely proud of our existing Prayer Book. Having an alternative Order of the Holy Communion seems to me like proposing to have an alternative bishop in the diocese. (Laughter.) I do not think either will really work very well. The Bishop of Durham yesterday assured us that he doubted whether these new changes, if they were introduced as they stand, would be really very satisfactory, and he urged, and very wisely urged, the importance of getting the Courts into a satisfactory position in good time. In a very common-sense way I watch, when possible, the man on the spot and the man of the time, and I feel we are not doing right at the present moment to make little of the wise men who lived over 250 years ago. I like to watch the movements that led to the earlier revisions of our Prayer Book. In the difference between the Prayer Book of 1552 and 1549 I believe we have a fine record of the dangers that were more clearly seen by the later date. When we say to ourselves, "In our days people would not be so foolish, and in our days these new devotions would not have a bad effect in general," and so on, I like to look back, and I see what those who knew the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. saw and knew, namely, that a great many things that we are now proposing to reinstate were better removed. That is the opinion of the man on the spot and the man of the time. If we restore these things we shall be doing that in a tentative and a hopeful spirit; but there we have the action of those who watched the thing actually before their eyes, and to such opinion I confess I am old-fashioned enough as to give very great weight.

Now General Approval in the National Assembly has constantly been taken to mean much more than the reception of the Report. If this was the reception of a report I should be quite ready to vote for it; but when a Measure has been generally approved, it would be ludicrous for it to come out as blank at the end. So when I am asked, do I generally approve this Measure, am I over-conscientious, do I pay too great regard, as I always try to do, to the accuracy of words, when I answer, "No, I do not approve; I do not give general approval to the Measure, for the reason first that the most important sections in it, namely, the alternative Order of the Holy Communion and the Reservation rubrics are a part that I cannot, as they stand, approve." It would not be a fair use of language to say that because I do really want some change, just those sort of changes that the Bishop of Chichester pointed out as non-controversial, I must

therefore approve the whole Measure, when I am disapproving of the most salient and the most revolutionary features in it. I find my experience is quite different to that of the Bishop of Truro. The Bishop of Truro expressed a hope that, when these new liberties were sanctioned, clergy and the people would lay their heads together and do what was felt wisest all round. The Measure as it stands entrusts the whole power to the clergy; and—I am dreadfully sorry to have to confess it—I find very often that the change is made first and then discussed, and then not discussed in that spirit of goodwill that might have come about if the discussion had taken place before the change. One does not vote for the Second Reading of a Bill if one is opposed to the greatest and most salient thing in the Bill. Therefore, as under our Standing Orders we cannot divide this Measure into two parts, the non-contentious and the contentious, the doctrinal and the non-doctrinal, and as I feel more strongly against the contentious parts than I do in favour of the non-contentious parts, I fear I should be untrue to my present judgment and should be stultifying my independence hereafter if I voted for General Approval.

The Bishop of Manchester: Your Grace,—I desire wholeheartedly to support the motion for General Approval of this Measure. I am quite ready when the time comes to consider sympathetically any proposal that may be made, either in this House or by one of the other Houses, for a separation of the different parts of the Measure, and the discussion of them separately upon their merits. If I were in the position of the Bishop of Norwich, and felt that it was definitely wrong to go forward at all with the proposals which deal with the Holy Communion Service, I think I should feel bound with him to vote against General Approval. But I have at this stage still a great hope that we may be able by the discussion that will take place throughout the Church to arrive at so large a measure of agreement with regard to the revision even of that service, that for the present I quite conscientiously and wholeheartedly give it General Approval. I am not at all eager that we should hasten action, especially with reference to that part of the Measure. We have to remember that the long discussion that went on in Convocation went on of necessity without any great public interest being taken in it by the body of the Church as a whole. The debates of Convocation are not fully reported in most newspapers, and if they were, the motions were liable to take the form that in a particular prayer a certain phrase should be omitted and another phrase substituted for it, so that the reader of the newspaper would have to get his Prayer Book and look out exactly what it was, and read it through again with the proposed alteration in it, before he would know exactly what was being discussed. It was more than we could expect that a very large number of people who themselves could not influence the discussion would undertake to do. Now that it has come before

the Assembly, it has also come prominently before the whole Church public, which has a complete form of service in its hands, and can consider its bearings. I think it is in the last degree desirable that there should be ample time for real consideration by the general body of the Church before any Measure is presented to the Assembly by this House for Final Approval. People will have become accustomed to the idea of revision, which is still a novelty, and opportunity of action with real agreement on the part of the Church will become far greater. Many of us used to clamour rather violently against the delays which were involved in the old machinery of Church legislation. It was a very serious thing to be blocked by the inadequacy of the machinery. But that does not at all mean that we are anxious to hustle through changes which may commend themselves to us now that we have a machine rather than allow full time for the machinery genuinely to work and the minds of people to be brought fully to bear upon the matter.

The form* that has been put in your Lordships' seats, which has a foreword by myself, is an indication of the kind of interest that is being taken in many parts of the Church in this matter; and I should not be surprised if other groups come together and make other proposals which will come before the National Assembly. I only wish to say with regard to this form, while I most heartily commend it to your consideration, I am in no way committed to support it either as a whole or in detail, and certainly in detail there are places in which I should wish not to adopt it.

I must come back, if I am allowed, before I close, to the questions that arise concerning the Revision of the Holy Communion service; but it is of the utmost importance that we should remember that though these are the most salient features of the proposals they are nothing like the whole of them. While it is true that the words "General Approval" do imply our assent to this Measure as it stands in general terms, subject to subsequent revision, it is not the same as Final Approval; and it may be perfectly legitimate to vote for the General Approval of a Measure which, if it came up unaltered for Final Approval, we should then have to vote against.

There is a need for the enrichment of the Prayer Book, and a very urgent need. That has already been brought before the House, and I do not wish to spend time upon it. There is in the Prayer Book, as we have received it, no direct reference to the whole task of evangelising the world. It can be read into the Prayer Book in many places—it is, of course, implicit in the Lord's Prayer itself—but there is nothing quite directly and specifically dealing with that primary obligation at all. There is nothing in it which, primarily and directly, deals with the whole matter of industrial peace and goodwill, the most urgent concern of our generation, and likely to be the urgent

* "A New Prayer Book, Part I. (Humphrey Milford). Price 6*d*.

concern of some generations to come. I think I am right in saying that even in the Schedule of revision as it stands there is nothing directly concerned with the maintenance of international peace. I shall venture when the time comes to move the introduction of an authorised prayer specifically dealing with that subject. There are prayers for use in time of war, but nothing for the maintenance of peace, to be used in time of peace, so far as I can find out. The Prayer Book, as it stands, seems to take war between nations for granted as the normal state of things. The Litany, as we all remember, came to life in the War. Every petition in it, very nearly, had a new and vital meaning. In Mattins, when we address God as the Author of Peace and Lover of Concord we go on to ask Him, not to maintain goodwill between peoples, but to defend us from the assaults of our enemies. It takes war for granted as a normal situation ; but we are longing to escape from that. ("Hear, hear.") Those are matters which are all genuinely of great consequence, because of the great movements and aspirations among the people of our time which ought to find expression in the ordered public worship of our Church. You may find them, as a matter of fact, either in outside services or else in unauthorised interpolations. While there is nothing illegal in spirit in the introduction of prayers for such things as I have mentioned into the services, yet, as the Bishop of Ely pointed out with great force, the moment one man has made an interpolation of a kind which most of us would agree to be perfectly reasonable and true to the spirit of the Church, it is very difficult to prevent somebody else from introducing an interpolation which he considers to be true to the spirit of the Church, but which the authorities of the Church do not. So we are left in the position of saying, "You may introduce what the bishops think is good, but not what the bishops do not think is good," and that may vary from time to time with changes in the *personnel* of the Episcopate. That is plainly a desperately unwholesome state of affairs. If we are to have a Prayer Book which expresses the needs of the souls of the people of our time, and are at the same time to restore respect for law in the Church, we must have a Prayer Book enriched in just the kind of way that a great number of these proposals do, in fact, enrich our Prayer Book.

That leads me on to the second point on which I would wish to say a word or two, namely, the recovery of the reverence for law. I do not wish to trust to the action of Courts, though I perfectly agree that we must have a system of Courts which commands the assent of the conscience of the whole Church, and it may be necessary when the time comes that those Courts should be called into play with coercive action. But I trust that we shall set about working in full hope that we shall avoid any such coercive action—("Hear, hear")—and with the determination to regard it always as a dreadful sign of weakness and failure when we have to resort to it. I do

not think it is possible that the Church will recover very rapidly from the state of chaos into which we have fallen; but I do believe that the health of the body itself will tend to extrude its own diseases and poisons if it is given the opportunity of functioning. We have a new opportunity, as I believe, through the activity of the National Assembly; and it would seem to me that when once we have got a Prayer Book which has been properly authorised, and accepted again by Convocation, and has received our Royal Assent, so that it has every sanction that it can have for its appeal to consciences trained in different schools, we shall be able to go very far towards the restoration of unity in the Church without falling back upon actual coercive action; and the further we can go the better. If in the course of our reforms we obtain dioceses of such size that it is reasonably possible to hold a Synod, and the Bishop were to state to the assembled Synod that he had called upon a certain incumbent to observe the law, and that the incumbent had still defied him, so that he felt bound to state before the clergy of the diocese that that incumbent was under censure, I believe that the body of the clergy, generally speaking, would come round to support him, and in the long run it would be found that the general opinion of the Church in support of its own laws would be in nearly all cases a sufficient stimulus. That, however, remains to be seen; but it is in that hope that we go forward, as I trust we shall.

Now I feel bound to ask leave to proceed, if I may, to the aspect of the subject that is mainly before us, because I think it is due to many anxious people in the Church, and particularly because I think it is due to Bishop Knox, of whom I at least have every reason to speak with affection, gratitude, and reverence; both because of my knowledge of the truly wonderful work that he did for the Church in the great diocese over which he presided so long, and for his astonishing kindness to myself. He has challenged us on first principles in theology, and I do not think it is fitting that this discussion should go through its whole length without some reference to the direct questions which he raises in the theological sphere. I feel singularly incompetent to make this attempt, but yesterday, on asking others who I thought might be going to do it, I was told that they did not intend to do so, and therefore I feel obliged to make the attempt.

Bishop Knox raises quite specifically the question whether there is any notion of sacrifice in the Eucharist in the revised Office, and has asked what is the nature of that sacrifice. It is that question which I think it only fair to attempt to answer, so that if possible anxiety may be allayed in some devout soul. Bishop Knox quotes the striking account of the transformation of the Communion Service effected by Cranmer, which Professor Burkitt offers in *Eucharist and Sacrifice*, and asks whether we accept or reject it. My reply would be, and I know how much the personal angle

of approach must influence what we say in the matter, that we cannot do either. If Cranmer intended what Burkitt describes, about which I am very doubtful, it may very well have been right at a time when the ethical aspect of worship, the moral implication of worship, had become almost submerged. But the result, while not false, is only a part of the truth. There is an insuperable difficulty in Burkitt's theory. It treats the self-oblation of the worshippers ("Here we offer and present unto thee," etc.) as the essential moment of the sacrifice. But that can hardly be the essential moment of any sacrifice which occurs in an alternative prayer which need not ever be used and is in fact frequently omitted. Cranmer not only moved this prayer but he made its use optional, which is a very curious way of marking it out as essential. Moreover, if the essential movement in our highest act of worship is the movement of our own wills (as this theory maintains) we are certainly involved in Pelagianism—the very last heresy that Bishop Knox would wish us to favour, though our own race is obviously very prone to fall into it, as it is the only classical heresy which ever originated in this island.

To set rightly this question of the Eucharistic sacrifice we must go back to the sacrifices of the Old Testament. It gathers up all the elements of that form of sacrifice which contains the sin offering, the burnt offering, and the peace offering. In the sixteenth century the whole issue was confused by the prevalent idea that the essential act in an animal sacrifice was the killing of the victim. Hence the conviction that if Christ is offered in the Eucharist it involves some repetition of the death of Christ. This was merely a mistake. The animal was killed to release the *life* which was supposed to reside in the blood; the essential act was the offering of the life, and it always typified the life of the worshipper. In the sin offering, the sin-stained soul offered as its representative the symbolically perfect life of the victim without blemish. This reappears in the consecration of the elements at the Eucharist. In the burnt offering the total consumption of the victim represents the total self-dedication of the worshipper: this reappears in the prayer of self-oblation, "Here we offer and present unto Thee ourselves, our souls and bodies." Then the worshipper was ready for the meal, wherein he ate of the food offered to God, a meal of fellowship with God; this reappears in the reception of the consecrated Bread and Wine. That order is perfectly logical; but its whole significance is so deepened as to be transformed by the death of Christ. For us there is only one sacrifice: it is the sacrifice of Christ.

But two questions at once arise. How did His execution ever come to be called a sacrifice, which is a religious ceremony? This was made both possible and necessary by His plainly sacrificial act at the Last Supper, which by His words He associated with His death. What He *did* was certainly sacrificial. What He said

plainly concerned His death. So the Apostles learnt that His death was a sacrifice. Historically it was His sacrificial act at the Last Supper which made it possible to speak of the Sacrifice of the Cross: it was not the Crucifixion which taught men to think of the Last Supper as a sacrifice.

But Christ as Man is not merely an individual. As Dr. Moberly expressed it, "He is Man not generically, but inclusively." His sacrifice set forth at a moment of time on Calvary is in truth the inner light of the perpetual sacrifice which consists in the coming of mankind into perfect obedience to God. This is not the time to dwell on the difficult but absolutely necessary doctrine that Christ is Humanity. But this doctrine pervades the Pauline Epistles, and is expressed particularly in the thought of the Church as the Body of Christ, growing to completeness as nations and individuals are brought into it. And it is noticeable that the same term is used here as of the consecrated Bread—the term "Body." Each is the Body of Christ, because each is the medium through which He himself becomes effective.

The sacrifice then is always Christ: and first as offered in the sacramental elements. He is not locally in the elements. Even the classical exponent of Transubstantiation, S. Thomas Aquinas, denies that Christ is in the Sacrament *sicut in loco*. But the Sacrament is a medium of His Presence to us, and that Presence, given under such a medium as to show that it is granted in order that it may be received (for bread and wine are food and drink), incorporates us into His Body: so that in the power of the eternal Sacrifice we may take our allotted share therein, "filling up what remains of His sufferings, for His Body's sake, which is the Church." So there is one sacrifice: achieved in fact and power on Calvary, represented in the breaking of the bread whereby He taught us the meaning of Calvary, reproduced in our self-dedication and our life of service in the world resulting therefrom, consummated in the final coming of the Kingdom: "We do show forth the Lord's Death till He comes." The Death and the Coming are the initial and crowning moments of the triumphant sacrifice. What sacrifice then do we offer? There is only one. Is it of the elements or of ourselves? It is of neither separately, but always of both: and the reality is something more even than this. The Body which, by the hands of the priest, the Church breaks and gives, is the Church itself, which is "the Messiah building Himself up into His fulness." Our offering of ourselves in the prayer of oblation is not an act of our own motion; it is our self-surrender to the movement in humanity of the sacrifice of Christ, the Universal Man.

Whether this is best expressed in the traditional order of the Canon or in the so-called "dislocation" that we have now in the Prayer Book, is a matter more fitly discussed when we come to detailed amendments. But it is this, as I conceive our duty, that we

must seek to embody in the form that we draw up. It is not easy, but it is less hard to express devotionally than doctrinally. The thought is present in the Lord's High Priestly prayer: "I in thee, and thou in me; that they may be perfected into one; that the world may believe that thou didst send me." Thus Christ offers the sacrifice and is Himself the victim. We, by repeating the sacrificial act which interpreted His death, bring ourselves within the movement of His sacrifice; and there we find ourselves united with all His servants of all times and places. We lift up our hearts to the Lord, and forthwith it is with angels and archangels and all the company of Heaven that we laud and magnify His glorious Name. In truth we do not offer any sacrifice; yet the Eucharist is a sacrifice. By repetition of His sacrificial act we become participants in His one sacrifice, which is the perfect dedication to the Father of the humanity which God in Christ has taken to Himself.

I apologise for this lame attempt to speak of what baffles speech, and is as familiar to your Lordships as it is to me. But we have been publicly asked by one who deserves our respect, and whose words justly carry weight in the Church, that we should declare our minds upon these points; and as we are holding public discussion before the Church, it seems to me that some such attempt ought to be made in the course of our discussion. ("Hear, hear.")

The Bishop of Liverpool: Your Grace and my Lord President, —I shall follow the line taken by my brother the Bishop of Ely and vote for General Approval of the Revised Prayer Book, but with very great and grave exception. I shall vote for its General Approval, because the Revised Prayer Book makes, I am sure, for a valuable enrichment of our public worship, because it brings it into line with modern thought, and because it gives elasticity to our services, which at present we lack. It represents the prayers, the thoughts, and the labour of seventeen years. I have been connected, as my brother the Bishop of Ely has been connected, with this movement from the very first, and I know the amount of labour and thought which has been bestowed upon it. It would expose us to the sport of the whole of Christendom if, after sixteen years of labour and thought, we were to reject the Revised Prayer Book.

I have three great reservations to make. First of all, I object most strongly to the method of an alternative Prayer Book. I object to it on the ground that it is most clumsy; and, not only that, but likely to make confusion worse confounded. I believe it will make for the irritation of a very large number of our congregations; it will create friction where at present there is very little friction, and if will tend to the deepening and widening of our unhappy divisions. Therefore I will vote most strongly when the time comes against the use of an alternative Prayer Book.

Secondly, I think the Revised Prayer Book, as it stands at

present, upsets the doctrinal balance of our present Book. It makes an alteration in the doctrine of the Church of England, and goes beyond the Letters of Business. There are two great and mysterious subjects upon which our Prayer Book at present is completely silent . one, Prayers for the Dead, and the other the nature of Eucharistic Sacrifice. Our Prayer Book is silent because the Scriptures are silent. It has always seemed to me that the great glory of the Church of England has been this : it requires its people to believe nothing but what can be proved by the most certain warranty of the Holy Scriptures. It gives wide opportunity for differences of opinion, but in its doctrine, as crystallised in our Prayer Book, it does not go beyond the teaching of Holy Scripture. But the Revised Prayer Book, in its Prayers for the Dead—most beautiful prayers, most godly prayers—goes beyond what the Prayer Book teaches at present. We are bidden to praise God for the dead in our prayers : we are never bidden to pray for them.

Secondly, there is the need of the Eucharistic sacrifice. I cannot follow my brother the Bishop of Manchester into the somewhat difficult statement that he has made with regard to the Sacraments. I should like to have time to read in print what he has stated, and to think it over ; but I think there is no doubt at all that in the Prayer Book at present we offer sacrifice to God in the Holy Communion. We offer, first of all, the sacrifice of our alms ; we offer the sacrifice of the unconsecrated Elements ; we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving ; and we offer the sacrifice of ourselves. But the offering of the *consecrated* elements as a sacrifice to God was deliberately cut out of the Church of England Prayer Book in 1552, and has never been restored. It was cut out because it was regarded as the embryo of the Sacrifice of the Mass. But in our Revised Prayer Book we have this new view—or old view, if you like to call it so—revived and brought back. In the allowance of the vestments it is brought back. When this question came before us first of all, seventeen years ago, I was then, and am still, in favour of allowing the use of a white linen vestment ; not because I wanted it myself, but I knew that some whom I honoured and loved, who held very different views on Church matters from me, desired thereby to give what they thought greater priestly dignity to the offering of Holy Sacrament. I was willing to meet them, but I desired only that that white vestment should be the cope and not the chasuble. The chasuble is historically the sacrificial vestment. In bringing back that sacrificial vestment you practically bring back into the Church of England the old doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Further, in the new proposals we have it expressed in the words, "And we entirely desire thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," now transferred from the Prayer after Ministration back again into the Consecration Prayer. Where the words stand to-day I do not think they lead at all to the

elements of Bread and Wine; but when you bring them back in the Consecration Prayer, then you offer to God the sacrifice of the Consecrated Elements. Because this prayer brings back again a doctrine which you may hold if you like as a private opinion, but which the Church of England has refused to hold because it cannot be proved by means of the certain warranty of the Holy Scriptures, I lift up my voice against it.

Thirdly, I object because it introduces the practice of Reservation of the Sacrament. It is sometimes said that we are only going back to a very primitive practice. If that primitive practice is the custom referred to by Justin Martyr, I would vote for it with all my soul. I think the practice of carrying the Elements straight from the Church to the sick and the aged and others who cannot attend is a most beautiful and significant practice. If you will limit your Reservation to that old practice, I am satisfied to support it. That is not Reservation. I think Dr. Westcott, a name ever to be revered in the Church of England, spoke of it as "Concurrent Communion." But if you reserve the Bread and Wine in Church, making what safeguards you like, it will lead sooner or later to the Adoration of Christ in those Elements. The experience of the last twenty years has shown this to be true. The Bishop of London would tell us so if he were here. We are only too sorry that sickness keeps him away. He was one of the bishops, when the bishops sought in every way to safeguard Reservation, who thought it could be safeguarded. Has he been able to safeguard it? Is not it a fact that to-day in the diocese of London the Sacrament is reserved and people are allowed to say their prayers before the reserved Sacrament? I believe it is. You cannot, my Right Reverend Brethren, safeguard this practice. If you admit Reservation for sickness, and the Elements are reserved in the Church, it will sooner or later lead to that unscriptural and uncatholic—I deliberately say uncatholic—custom of the Adoration of Christ under the veils of the Bread and Wine.

The great object of this revision of the Prayer Book is to bring back order and unity into the Church of England. I believe, if these three points I have mentioned had only been left out, if the advice of the Northern Convocation had been carried out—and the North has a certan amount of common-sense—and the Holy Communion omitted entirely from this Prayer Book, except so far as the enrichment of the first part of the service in the way of preface or offertory sentences was concerned,—I believe that that would have removed a very great source of opposition. I can only say, speaking of the diocese of Liverpool, that three hundred of our clergy met together, and, speaking roughly, when the alterations of the Communion Service were brought before them, two-thirds voted against these proposed alterations. When two hundred of our laity met together and the matter of the Reserved Sacrament for the sick was brought before them, out of two hundred representative laity only ten voted for it;

and when it came to voting for the alteration in the Canon, I think four of the two hundred voted for it. That shows what south-west Lancashire thinks on these subjects. I desire, as an old man nearing the end of his course, who has been brought up in the Church of England, who loves the Church of England, who is what he is to-day spiritually because he is a member of the Church of England through God's grace, that we hand on to those who come after us this great Church of the West, with its great past and its still greater future, destined, I believe, if only we are true to our Church, to be the great Missionary Church of the West, and the means of the re-union of Christendom, united and ordered; only we must not purchase our unity at the cost of truth. We have received the greatest heritage, and we must hand it on intact to those who come after us. (Applause.)

THE BISHOP OF S. ALBANS: Your Grace,—After the speech that we have just listened to, I find it extraordinarily difficult to follow, more particularly because I profoundly disagree with some of the remarks made by the Bishop of Liverpool, to whom I and scores and hundreds of men and women in this country owe an enormous debt of gratitude for many years past. But I could not myself give a silent vote for the General Approval of this Measure in this House. I intend to vote for General Approval, but before doing so, I feel bound to say something. I have certain reservations, but they are very different from those which the Bishop of Durham has mentioned, and frankly, as a whole, they take the form of wishing to see further additions made to the Measure which is before the National Assembly at the present time.

It has been said that there is no general demand, no popular demand, for the revision of the Prayer Book. I believe it is most important, for the sake of the Church as a whole, to challenge that. I believe that there is not a popular demand in the sense of that great body, alas, of men and women in this country who at the present time do not darken the doors of any place of worship. But there is a popular demand, I maintain, not merely amongst the clergy, or certain sections of the clergy, but amongst the regular worshippers to-day in the churches of the Church of England in this country; that is to say, among the people who are really anxious for the revival of religion in England, and who, though they may have now got accustomed to things and can possibly tolerate a great many things in our Book of Common Prayer, nevertheless feel tremendously anxious for the younger generation who are in many cases out of heart altogether with any form of institutionalism, and more especially with the formularies of the Church of England as representing the Christian Faith to them when they do go to church. I believe that that alternative Office of the Holy Communion which was presented to us

yesterday with a preface by the Bishop of Manchester, which some of us knew already, does represent men of all parties, men who are alive to the needs of religion to-day in England, and not only in England but throughout the world, and who are profoundly convinced that revision is necessary in the daily offices of the Church and in the occasional offices. One of the things that is of prime importance is that we should revise the office of the Visitation of the Sick on the ground that it is, as I believe, absolutely un-Scriptural. It presents an idea of physical disease which is entirely un-Christian, and which you cannot see in the New Testament at all. The whole of the actions of our Lord are dead against it. That is only one example. Other speakers have mentioned other things which are essentially important in the way of revision, and I believe myself that the office of the Holy Communion needs revision to-day. I believe the people who want it are not merely those who are known as Anglo-Catholics, but I believe there is a growing body of opinion in the Church of England to-day representing not only the extreme Catholic but representing the great body of Central Churchmen and a vast body of truly Evangelical clergymen who want to see the Lord's own service restored to its proper place in the normal religious life of the ordinary man and woman and boy and girl and child of this country as the great central act of corporate worship and communion, and they want to see a Liturgy which shall lose nothing of the glories of the past, but will be simple and intelligent, and be truly enriched, and more intelligible and more real to the ordinary Christian.

Therefore I personally am going to vote for the General Approval of the Measure, but if it is to satisfy the needs of to-day, and the needs are various, I believe we have to face the fact that we must be more generous in what we are prepared to give, not grudgingly but with both hands, to meet the legitimate demands of a very considerable section of the Church of England to-day. I hold no brief for any party in the Church of England, but I am bound to say that it seems to me, and it has seemed to me during the last three years since I came back from overseas to this country to live, that what are known as Anglo-Catholics have received scant recognition except in the way of abuse. (Laughter.) I do not hold with everything that is done in the name of Anglo-Catholicism. Who could? There are impossible people in every section of the community, and the Anglo-Catholic Movement is no exception to that rule. But I believe that they have legitimate demands which we as bishops have to face in no ungrudging spirit, and that we should listen to what they are and to try understand them. That would be a great thing to do. It has been the boast of the Church of England, and I may add the traditional boast, that it has been comprehensive. I believe in that. I heartily believe in the comprehensiveness of the Church of England. I wish to see it

maintained. But if you are going to maintain it, my Lords, I for my own part am convinced that we have to readjust that comprehensiveness to meet the conditions existing to-day, otherwise the Church of England will become what some people say it is already, a mere sect. It will cease in any real way to represent the religious life of this country or the nation. Therefore, if that comprehensiveness is going to be maintained, it means we must be prepared frankly, generously and courageously to enlarge the limits of comprehension. Only by doing so, I believe, will it be possible to restore order and discipline. I am second to none in my desire to see order and discipline restored, but I should like to say this, and I shall certainly say it when the House of Laymen are present if I get the opportunity, that it is generally assumed that the only lack of discipline is amongst the clergy, but I believe that it is lacking amongst the bishops, and I am quite certain that it is lacking amongst the laity. Until we can recover the discipline of the laity (and I believe a first preliminary is to recover the discipline of the clergy) the Church can never reach out to its fullest life which God is waiting to give it. We want to get rid of controversy and get on with our real business and set free energies which are—this strikes one tremendously on coming back to England—so much used up in controversy to-day, but which might be set free for the primary work of the Church, which is to win the world for our Lord.

Now the Bishop of Durham has said some hard things about the Anglo-Catholics, but then we are accustomed to those sort of hard things by now. He said that law-breaking was common, yet the Catholic (by which he meant the Anglo-Catholic) stood alone in breaking the law on principle, and in refusing to accept the reputed authority of the Ecclesiastical Courts. Later on he admitted, and I was delighted to see that he did, that the Ecclesiastical Courts are not such as the general conscience of the clergy could approve.

The Bishop of Durham: I did not say that. What I did say was that it was impossible to use the Courts unless the general conscience of the clergy did approve them. In point of fact that general conscience does not approve them at this moment, but they quite satisfy my conscience.

The Bishop of S. Albans: I was talking about the general conscience of the clergy. I am all for altering the Courts, but I do want to add a word to what the Bishop of Manchester said. I do not believe you are going to get discipline in any Church in Christendom simply by Ecclesiastical Courts. You are going to get it by the sort of discipline which I believe is only engendered when you get your bishops, as rulers in the Church, in the closest possible touch not only with individual clergymen in their dioceses, but with the great body of presbyters who are under their

discipline, and doing the work under them in their diocese. I want to see, as the Lambeth Conference wanted to see, a restoration of a constitutional episcopate in this country. Until we get synods as a regular part of the ordinary machinery of our work, I do not think we shall ever really have peace and progress in the Church of England. However much you reform the Ecclesiastical Courts, unless you are prepared to give a greater latitude or increase the limits of comprehension to-day, I do not believe you will get that peace which we all desire.

Then comes the question of limits. I do not want at this hour to enter into any question of detail, but I do want to say this: I approached the E.C.U. proposal with a considerable amount of prejudice. I studied it with such ability as I have got, and I quite expected to find things which would not be consonant, as I thought, with what I have been brou ht up to believe are the doctrines and teaching of the Church of England. I am bound to say I cannot find anything of that kind. I have asked several people to show me what it is, but they have not been able to find anything.

The Bishop of Durham: Does the Bishop of S. Albans accept the E.C.U. statement about Reservation?

The Bishop of S. Albans: I am coming to that. Surely the only test is: Is a thing true? Anglicanism seeks truth in order to follow it, with Scripture and with tradition as its touchstone. When considering a proposed change, I submit that the question should not be asked: Is it Roman, or is it Greek, or is it Protestant, or even is it Anglican, but Is it true? It is to that, and that alone, it seems to me, we can look to set the limits of comprehension. Therefore, frankly, I am going to vote for and urge those amendments which satisfy this test, and which also meet the legitimate demands of people who I consider have a perfect right to have their demands met, if possible, in the Church of England to-day.

The Bishop of Durham has asked me whether I hold with the E.C.U. statement about Reservation. That is an extraordinarily important point, and also an extraordinarily sacred one. I have not said, and I do not say here, that I am tied by any proposal which is made by the E.C.U., but what I say with regard to Reservation is this, that we should in the rubric make it perfectly clear that the Church of England as such gives permission to the parish clergy to reserve the blessed Sacrament for the purposes of Communion. I do not wish to see it limited to the sick, because I have had experience in my last diocese—and I have no doubt I shall have experience in my present diocese—where Communion with the Reserved Sacrament for whole people is under present conditions almost essential, where those people have been taught the blessing and value of the Holy Communion. I want to

see it not limited to the sick, but I want to see it limited to the Communion. On the question whether it is an inherent right of the parish priest or not I understand that ancient Canons say that it is.

The Bishop of Durham: What about the authority of the Church of England?

The Bishop of S. Albans: It is an extraordinarily difficult subject. I say that what we have to do, as a living part of the Catholic Church, is to legislate with regard to these matters. I am not tied by what happened in any particular century. I am seeking for truth with Scripture and tradition as its touchstones. Truth is what I believe to be the basis of the Anglican Church. We want this question approached in the House of Bishops, and the House of Clergy and the House of Laity, without prejudice, facing the facts to-day as they really are. I believe that if we dealt generously with this question we should then be able to claim to have done much towards attaining peace in the Church. I believe there are men here in the House of Bishops who are scholars and historians, who would bear me out in saying that in practically every part of the Catholic Church, even to-day where Reservation is customary, it is always left to Episcopal Regulations to regulate the method of Reservation and the use that the blessed Sacrament shall be put to. I have no hesitation in saying, and I have given some thought and care to it, that at the present moment I for one have no authority at all for authorising public devotions to our blessed Lord in the blessed Sacrament; but it seems to me absolute folly to imagine to-day that you can so restrain the reservation of the blessed Sacrament as to prevent individual people privately saying their prayers before it. I submit that the Book of Common Prayer accepts the principle that there is a difference between official corporate devotions and private devotions. Every one of us clergy, if we wish to do so, can say our office privately in Latin, or in any other tongue that we prefer, but when it comes to saying it in church we have to say it in English. I want to see a distinction drawn between the Church giving its official approval for what I believe myself there is neither Scriptural nor historical warrant, and allowing people (if it is a spiritual help to them, as we know it is a spiritual help to hundreds of people) to be able to come into church and make their meditations or intercessions or say their prayers where the blessed Sacrament is reserved. I frankly admit that this plea that I am making for greater comprehension always within the limits of truth—and I am not laying down what those limits are at the moment—does do away with that rigid tight uniformity which we have tried to maintain, and failed hopelessly in maintaining, in past centuries. I shall part with it without any tears, because I believe that uniformity is impossible

and that it is wholly un-Christian. In the whole of the known Creation of God, including Man, I see a perfectly marvellous unity, but no uniformity at all. I believe to-day there is a widespread revolt against this rigid uniformity which is only uniformity in name and perfectly hopeless to carry out. At the same time I believe along with it there is a strong and widespread desire for unity. I know there are cranks. The Church of England would not be representative of the nation if we got rid of our cranks—(laughter)—but the soundest Christian opinion in every party to-day is more and more moving together upon the basis of recognising that there are diversities of temperament, and that those temperaments, not least in worship and in expression, will stress (whatever we like to do in the House of Bishops or the National Assembly or Parliament) one or other aspect of the one truth. There is this movement from different parties coming together because they believe that it is only the spirit of love and brotherhood and common service which can make men of one mind in a house.

We were exhorted yesterday to quit us like men and be strong, and I say quite honestly that all of us need that reminder. Yet I think all of your Lordships are familiar with a certain type of strong man who seems to imagine that the criterion of strength is a sort of mulish obstinacy coupled with an active policy of irritating repression. I do not believe we want that sort of strength to-day either in the House of Bishops, in the House of Clergy, or in the House of Laity. The strength which we need is the strength of the really strong man, who is big enough to face the facts, who is generous enough to believe the best of others, who is humble enough to know that he has a good deal yet to learn, and who is faithful enough to believe that the Holy Spirit will lead us into all truth. That is the spirit, and I believe the only spirit, in which we can ever hope triumphantly to overcome the difficulties which lie in our way in Prayer Book revision, and in a hundred other ways, and set the Church of England free once again to devote its whole energies to its primary work of winning souls to Christ.

[*Adjourned for an interval.*]

The Bishop of Chelmsford: There has been a great deal said respecting the work done in regard to the revision of the Prayer Book, but I do not think any single word has been said of real thanks to those who have done the work. I have never been on any of the recent Committees, therefore I should like to express the thanks which I feel, and which tens of thousands of Churchmen would like to express, to the men who have given time, thought and study to produce the Revised Prayer Book as we have it to-day. I deeply regret the absence of Bishop Gibson, who gave an enormous

amount of time to the work—and did it so fairly—and tried to meet everybody in the best spirit possible.

I am here to-day to give General Approval to the Measure. I do it for these reasons: first, because of the value of the revision. I rather disagreed with my friend the Bishop of Durham when he said that the revision was undertaken mainly for the restoration of order. I know that that comes in, but I was looking at a speech that I made long before the Report of the Royal Commission was issued, in which I advocated, in 1902, a very thorough revision of the Prayer Book. I am thankful for the valuable work that has been done in enriching the Prayer Book and helping the clergy, especially in large parishes, in regard to their work under modern conditions.

Secondly, and here I must say I differ almost from every speaker who has addressed your Lordships, because I believe that modern life must express itself in divers ways. I want to make a strong point of that. I know it may be said that everybody should pray exactly alike, and everybody should do exactly as everybody else does. That may seem ideal, but I think it is absolutely contrary to the present spirit of the age. We have already (unauthorised it is true) alternative uses. I have to preach, as your Lordships have, Sunday by Sunday in different churches; and whether it is a so-called advanced or a so-called Evangelical church, when I get there I never know what is going to happen; prayers are put in of all kinds; not one of them has been submitted to me as bishop, but there they are. This is not a new thing. Even in our present Prayer Book, which we all love so much, we have the principle admitted of alternative uses, you may do this or that; it is not a new principle introduced into the Church of England, it is an extension of that principle; a very great extension, but only an extension.

We shall never get, in my opinion, to absolute uniformity. At the Lambeth Conference held three years ago, when we had a wonderful vision of the Re-United Church, we were careful to state very clearly that in the Re-United Church each individual group would be allowed to retain to a large extent its own mode of worship. If that proposal comes to fruition, we shall have a great number of alternative uses. The question arises whether, that being so, it is not right now in our own borders to have a greater variety than we have ever known before. Then again, I believe education has increased a desire among men to express themselves in their own way. Is this wrong? Is it a thing to be absolutely set aside as bad in principle, theory, and practice? John Wesley wrote: "Uniformity in worship would never have been insisted upon had man consulted the Word of God only." Is there anything Scriptural to say that diversity of worship is contrary to the spirit of Christ or contrary to the spirit of brotherhood among men? Therefore I am not altogether sorry to have an alternative principle adopted in the Church of England to-day.

Thirdly, I give General Approval because the present proposal seeks to repeal Section 3 of the 1872 Act which conferred great powers on individual bishops. I want those powers curbed, and I want, instead of so much responsibility upon individual bishops, more responsibility thrown upon the House of Bishops as a whole. I want the day to dawn in the Church of England when a bishop can say publicly to his clergy, "Before I sanction that I want to consult my brethren in Convocation." I think that the Catholic position of individual bishops is that they should have behind them the corporate power of the whole Episcopate.

Fourthly, I give General Approval because the present proposals do not, in my opinion, affect the doctrine of the Church of England. I have before me the declaration that will be signed by all candidates for ordination. If you look at that declaration you will see that the new proposals, if carried through, will still leave the doctrinal position of the Church of England to be interpreted as it was before :—

> "I assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and to the Book of Common Prayer and to the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. I believe the doctrine of the Church of England *as therein set forth* to be agreeable to the Word of God. I will use the forms in the Prayer Book prescribed and none other, except so far as is permitted in the alternative Book constituted by the revised Prayer Book (Permissive Use) Measure, 1923, or as shall be ordered by lawful authority."

There it is expressly stated. If you want to know what the doctrine of the Church of England is, you are not to go to the revised Prayer Book, but to the present Prayer Book. That is the meaning of the declaration as set forth there. That is an important matter which has not been mentioned hitherto in the debate. You may say by implication that it will be otherwise interpreted, but as a matter of law it is stated, "The doctrine as therein set forth."

Now, having said that I give General Approval, I must, like all my brethren who have gone before, say that when the Committee stage is reached I shall have something to say as to points on which I shall have to differ from the proposals. I want something to be put in the revised Prayer Book to avoid its despotic use. We have in the Convocation proposals a clause giving the laity certain powers with regard to the use of the new Book, regulated by the bishop. That portion has been left out. It was argued that that might come under the Parochial Church Council Measures. I do not think it is a matter for the Parochial Church Councils. I think when we as bishops are issuing a book of Common Prayer, we must lay down somewhere in that Book ourselves, not leave it to another Measure altogether, how this Book is to be used. I do not think we ought to leave it to the individual incumbent to say. "We will have the old Book, or the new Book."

Secondly, I agree with the Bishop of Durham as to Ecclesiastical

Courts. If we do not deal with the Ecclesiastical Courts, we shall give a chance for fresh chaos to arise after revision. Therefore I am anxious that we should proceed at once to deal with Ecclesiastical Courts. On my motion, in the Upper House, Convocation passed a Resolution saying that this matter should receive immediate attention at the National Assembly. Three years have passed, and we have not been able to do it. It is a matter of supreme importance at once to deal with our Courts in such a way as to bring them into line with the general sentiment and goodwill of the Church of England.

My main proposition, when we come into Committee, will be that we should postpone the consideration of the Canon and Reservation. My reasons are these: If we insist on these two points, we may wreck the whole position with regard to revision. They are matters which arouse on all sides intense feeling and great controversy. And I am so anxious that we should get the other parts of the Prayer Book which are generally acceptable, and which we believe will help forward the life and spiritual growth of the Church of England, that I want to get those through. But my main reason for wishing for postponement is that I do not think we are at the moment ready for a settlement of either of these two questions, the Canon or Reservation. The proposals made, for instance, with regard to the Canon will be fiercely fought. You have only to read what my venerable and ever-beloved friend the Dean of Canterbury says time after time on this point. He, with his great personality and great learning and great force, will use all his power to defeat the proposals made. But are those proposals, even if they are forced through, going to do any good? If the Secretary of the English Church Union represents the English Church Union, they are not. He says—I am quoting his own words: "It is of importance that bishops and all other persons concerned should understand that there is not the slightest hope of securing the acceptance by catholic-minded priests or laity of the proposals of the National Assembly Committee as they stand." If the Secretary of the English Church Union represents the Anglo-Catholic Party, I ask, "Is it worth while going on discussing and trying to carry through legislation relating to the Canon that will not be accepted by a very large party in the Church of England to-day? I question it very much; in fact, I go so far as to say that in my opinion the present proposal regarding the Canon is dead. We have to consider whether we shall maintain the *status quo* and just go on as we are, or whether we shall consider a larger question of revision altogether.

Reference has been made to the proposals of the English Church Union. Those proposals I have gone through most carefully. One has to admit that they are admirably drawn, that they have a sequence, that they have a logical feeling right through them which we cannot

but admire; but I wish that those proposals, instead of being put forth by a party organisation, had come through the usual channels of church life. The English Church Union have their representatives on all our corporate bodies, and I think it would have been better if those proposals had been put forward in one House of Convocation instead of being issued by a society, however great that society may be. There is much in them of which one could approve, there is very much of which one would disapprove. I could not myself vote for them as they stand to-day, but what I do say is this, that they must receive consideration. The very weight of learning and of scholarship of the men who propose them show that they must receive at the hands of Churchmen respectful consideration, and the Spirit of Christ demands it too.

This morning we had an epoch-making speech by the Archbishop of York—I cannot call it anything else. When you have one of the two Primates of England getting up and suggesting that we should allow the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., that is an epoch-making speech. I think it has altered the whole situation. I do not see how we can go on discussing now the proposals of the Canon as suggested in the present revision. We must face the qustion whether we are going to review the situation. A wider range has come into the world of practical politics by the speech of the Archbishop of York, and, whether we like it or not, we shall have to face the re-opening of the whole question of the Canon.

How is this question going to be settled? I venture to suggest that it ought not to be attempted to be settled by the beating of the party drum, or by party cries or party proposals. I do not want to draw up an Evangelical prayer book. Sometimes our Anglo-Catholic friends forget that, if we had drawn up the Prayer Book, we should not have drawn it up as it is; in the baptismal service there are many things thousands of us object to, but we have never asked for a new Prayer Book: we have been contented, more or less, with our present Prayer Book. We are not going to settle these questions by balancing party gains and losses: we must approach the question in a bigger spirit, the Spirit of Christ. I often think that what shocks disciples may be music in the ears of our Blessed Lord. The big drum and the noise of Salvation Army bands perhaps sets one's teeth on edge; yet, shall I say it reverently, can we not think of the Great Father in Heaven looking down and saying, "Hark! I hear my children cry!" On the other hand, you may have in S. Paul's Cathedral, or, say, even in S. Peter's at Rome, that which strikes thousands of Christians as mere formalism and to a large extent superstition; yet can you not imagine the great Christ looking down and saying, "Hark! I hear my little child cry!" Yet we, as disciples, do not seem to get into the Spirit of the Master Himself, and look at these things from His point of view—"I am of Paul. I am of Apollos. I am of the English Church Union. I am

of the Church Association." Can we not get out of that spirit, and see whether we cannot do what our Master tells us, and leave the dealing with tares to Him? I could not help, as I came here yesterday, thinking: Nineteen hundred years ago: and here are the bishops of the greatest Church in this country spending two days deciding how we and our people shall say "Our Father." That is what it comes to: How shall we draw near to the presence of our Lord? And yet, in England to-day, shaking and rocking to and fro, tens of thousands of men are not saying "Our Father" in any way whatever. These are the men who ought to receive our attention to-day, instead of spending two days deciding how Christian people should say "Our Father." Is it not time the discussion should close, that we should try to get out of the depth of party into the region of the Spirit of Christ, and look at Him who looked at a world full of sin, yet, because it was full of sin, came down to redeem it and die? Therefore I venture to ask all of us, whether we call ourselves this, that, or the other, to try to take the proposals that are made to us to-day, not in a party sense, but first of all spend some time on our knees and ask for the Holy Spirit Himself to guide us as to how to receive these proposals, and deal with them when the time comes.

The Bishop of Winchester: I think we shall all agree that the Bishop of Chelmsford has added, by the speech which he has just made, to the other services which he had rendered to different sections of the Church of England. We are thankful to him for that speech: but I would rather like to pass from that to the general character of this debate. I speak in the presence of representatives of the laity, and it would be interesting to know what the impressions of the debate which have passed through their various minds have been: but for my own part I will say with perfect confidence that this debate has justified to the full the submission of this matter to the House of Bishops, publicly expressing, so far as the public are willing to attend, their own views upon the matter: and I should doubt very much whether a person accustomed to parliamentary or civic debate would not say that the debate to which we have listened has been a remarkable debate in point of the level of ability, in point of the characteristic individuality of the different speeches, and of the way in which speech after speech, not repeating one another, has shed different lights upon a question of extraordinary difficulty and complication.

The issue before us is this: Shall we give General Approval to this Measure? I have not the least doubt what our answer ought to be, and for this reason—that if I can conceive that we should turn this down, it means for the moment a negative to movement within the Church of England. I think we hardly sufficiently remember, not only how essential movement (as well, of course, as stability and continuity) is to the life of any individual or any institution, but how

essential it is to the life of an institution like our own. We took upon ourselves at the time of the Reformation an enormous responsibility: we took upon ourselves the responsibility of taking our own fate into our hands, and going forward in the Name of the Lord as well as we could, in view of what seemed to us or our predecessors the intolerable condition into which the Church at large had come. But what I do ask that we should consider is that we should not stereotype what was done at that time, and under those conditions. I cannot imagine anything which would be more unwise, more unhistorical, and more, in the deepest, strongest sense, impolitic. The Prayer Book and the use of the Prayer Book is an expression to us of our unity, stability, and continuity. The services which the Prayer Book has rendered to the Church and to the people of England, and through them more widely, are above expression and above value. I cannot think that that justifies us in treating the Prayer Book, in days such as these in which we live, as a thing which is the Ark of Covenant. We know that, in the grave matter of the Canon, our fathers before us, who tried to look at these matters in the light of Catholic truth and practice, could not be too grateful that we had the Prayer Book: and, while with certain changes, the Prayer Book remained a witness to the true character of the Sacrament, those who speak of that would surely not forget the shameful and miserable treatment of the Sacrament which came in the days that followed. I am old enough to remember just the last instances, as it were, of the kind of way in which the Sacrament was treated in parish churches under the old *régime*; anything less worthy of its dignity, anything less reverent, anything less worthy of its true relation to the common life of the whole people and the needs of souls, I really cannot imagine. We went on with the Prayer Book; thank God we did. We were not, even then, using the Prayer Book, with the intelligence which any book requires in connection with what lies behind it, and the principles which it involves, when we consider whence those principles came, and what they carried with them. When we look back to that, and when we look at the Prayer Book, not detached and by itself, but as it was in the period in which it was framed, and as it was in the miserable period which followed, and then through the changes in the lifetime of some of us up to the time in which we stand; the moral surely is, that, while we preserve with the utmost care the scheme which the Prayer Book gives, we should not expect it to be the last word in the worship of a community which started out to find its own way, as some would have said, on lines at once Catholic and Protestant. I am quite convinced that what we want, is to look at the period in which we are as a period, an epoch, the importance of which we cannot overrate. It is a time of movement all round; full of revolutionary possibilities in political and, no doubt, in ecclesiastical life—a period in which Bolsheviks and other men of violence or extremes find ample opportunity. One of the bishops asked us to remember the

truth of the guidance of the Holy Spirit I think I have learned in the course of my life to be truly thankful to God for the way in which our difficult movements have been overruled, and for the progress which we have been allowed to make; and therefore I believe that He has a purpose for us, and that if we will go forward quietly, trustfully and lovingly, we shall, under His guidance, be able to find a way where, I must own, pure reason would often find an *impasse*.

We remember the Lambeth Conference of 1920. I went into that Conference, as I think many others did, thinking we were going straight up to a stone wall on the question of re-union. I do not overvalue the importance of what the Lambeth Conference did, but we all came out of that Conference with a sense that God had shown us what we had not foreseen, and given us what was a precious and invaluable gift. The effect of that on our individual minds and souls, the effect of that on the life of the Church community, was, I think, something which affects and ought to affect our whole tone. I do feel that we should not make our personal, individual or party views on these different matters the measure of what can be accomplished in the days to come. We have had this touching plea from the Bishop of Chelmsford and others that we should try to understand one another. There is plenty of time for that; the really important matter is that we should all respond to Cromwell's appeal and believe that we can be sometimes wrong: and (what is perhaps a little more difficult) believe that others whom we regard definitely as our opponents may be sometimes right.

The Bishop of Durham very properly introduced, and others have followed, the question of lawlessness and coercion. Somebody said the matter of Courts was "long overdue." I frankly say I do not believe a word of it. By saying that, I am not saying that I think the Church, which has no power of definite appeal against wilfully contumacious members, is in a happy condition: of course it is not. But I remember a period better than some who are here to-day, a period in which we lived under the belief that a reference to the Law Courts was the right way of getting through our difficulties. I remember the contention of those times, the passion of those times, the dissension which was called out. I can only say, for myself and others—I hope it was not merely a desire to have a quiet time and so on—that the relief when, by common consent, it was abandoned, was immense. Has it worked for harm in the Church since? That is a difficult question, and I cannot answer it in a sentence; but do you think you would have dealt better with whatever question you take up—the Reservation question, say—if the Courts had been in active working, and the first men who did extreme things in the way of Reservation had been carried off to the Courts? I think all who have had experience would say, No: you would have inflamed partisanship; you would have thrown great

numbers of people into support of the more hotheaded or less satisfactory members. Nothing is more true than what was said by one of the bishops to the effect that, if you make the extreme members of a party the object of your attack, the result will be that you will get the party to back them up and defend them, and so to be more and more leavened with what you probably rightly think is the venom in the position they take up.

As regards the outlook, the anxiety I feel is: How shall we be able to deal with extremists of different kinds? The Courts are one expedient: the other expedient is a much vaguer one; but I believe that something by which the real moral opinion of the body of the clergy and the body of the church in the diocese can find expression, will have a real measure of coercive effect. One or two of my brethren among the bishops have been trying to do something of the kind not without success. I have been myself trying with a certain body of clergy, in a quite private and informal way, something of the same kind about Reservation. I think there will be a clear tendency in the body of those who are interested in the matter to acknowledge the claim of loyalty, and to acknowledge what is put before them about the dangers to which such and such a practice is liable. There is also a much smaller body of people who on conscientious grounds will not; but I think that in the future those people will have a new pressure put upon them when they realise that it is a real appeal that they are being plied with, an appeal to which the mind even of those with whom they are accustomed to act responds. Some of them, no doubt very troublesome people, will think they have done their part in holding out as regards what is their right: but they will not be able to press it further in the presence of that expression of the conscience and mind of the living Church. Whether I am right or wrong in that, no doubt the die-hards of different parties will be our difficulty. But I do not think we can exaggerate the way in which people have come together and have understood one another. Now we have men, shall I say young men, coming on, represented by such a bishop as the present Bishop of Manchester, who share with us seniors whatever is deepest, but have their own way of looking at things, who introduce into the discussion of these matters a new element, who help to efface mere party lines; and I cannot help believing that God, who has led us in the times past, will lead us on still by the power of the Holy Spirit.

Though I cannot see to-day how the question about the Canon can be adjusted by consent, nor can I say how you can allow what I think would be perfectly legitimate about Reservation without exposing yourselves to very serious risk, I think that some way will be found, and I am sure the other alternative is hopeless. To say we cannot move, that we can only hold fast to the Book which was prepared in a time of tremendous stress and tremendous new responsi

bility, doctrinal and other—at a time when the fires of persecution were still burning; that we are to clasp that Book to our breasts and say: "This is all we can do: we cannot consent to consider all that has happened since; the immense developments of knowledge on such subjects, the immense labour and study on these subjects, the immense accumulation of devotional experience on the matter: we can do nothing better than clasp Cranmer's Book to our breasts and go on"—I cannot think that represents the real position in the life of the Church of England to-day.

I should like to join in what was said by the Bishop of Chelmsford about the importance of what has fallen from the Archbishop of York, not merely because I think that proposal has a very real value, but also because I think that it has given to the debate a wider tone. I think it has shown that the question is not merely one of revising this and that detail, but that we are living through a period in which we must try reverently, studiously and charitably to find our principles, and to apply them, with reverence to the God who has given us His marvellous work of revelation and redemption, so much higher and wider than our capacity for understanding, and with mutual charity one to another.

THE BISHOP OF EXETER: I should like to put before the House a possible compromise. The tendency of the debate has been to show that, unless some compromise can be come to, the whole Prayer Book revision will be imperilled and certainly that part which is most important, that is, the Holy Communion. Anyone who has studied the constitution of the National Assembly knows that, without any wish to obstruct on the part of anyone (there will be real goodwill all through to get the Measure through), the time taken must be very long. Therefore the danger that we run is that our differences of opinion may so prolong our debates that we may not be able to come to any result perhaps for several years. You have heard the compromise suggested by the Archbishop of York, a most valuable compromise, and I should accept it personally quite willingly, but I very much doubt whether that would be accepted by the Evangelical Party. I am going to suggest another compromise, and that is that we accept the answer to the Letters of Business given by the Convocation of Canterbury, and that we refuse amendments to it on the ground that it has been the work of experts for seventeen years. If we once begin to consider one amendment, we must consider all amendments. That is why I think a great mistake has been made by the Committee. You have already heard what deep theological discussion we get into when we begin these very difficult questions. Surely we can say, "These questions have been discussed for seventeen years; here is the answer: this is given to us by experts. It is not a final answer, it is only an answer for five years, but we accept it as such." If we accept that compromise,

I think we shall get something through. My real fear is that the result of all these debates will be that we shall find ourselves sitting here year after year with a proposition before us which will end in nothing. There is another reason why it will be a very good arrangement to come to. We have been told that the object of this provision is to secure the Church from lawlessness. We have been told that the Courts are to be reformed. Clearly, if again you study the mechanism of the National Assembly you will see those are ideals, which will probably not come into actuality for many years. Therefore I think we can put out of sight any reform of the Courts as likely to happen within the near future. Therefore you want the compromise you come to to be one which can be accepted by everybody. I do think you can appeal to the great Catholic Party on these grounds: you can say, "I know the answer to the Letters of Business does not satisfy you, but throughout the history of the Church bishops have met together and, guided by the Holy Spirit, have made a decision. We are only asking you to follow the great tradition of the Church in accepting this decision." I do not want to say a word against the authority of the National Assembly, but I do see, and I think we all see, that the authority of this decision must rest on the fact that it is the decision of the synods of the Church, not of the National Assembly. If this compromise is accepted, it should not be applicable to the Province of York until it has been accepted by the Convocation of York. We should not be interfering in any way with the synodical rights of the Province of York.. Unless you can get this consent from the great part of the clergy all your efforts will only end in further confusion. I quite agree with what several of the bishops have said about allowing diversity of use, but that must have some authority behind it. If you fail to pass some Measure, what will your position be? You will have one suggestion made by the National Assembly, you will have another suggestion made by the Convocation of Canterbury, another by the Convocation of York, another by the English Church Union, and another by other people. All these suggestions will have adherents among the clergy, and it will be very hard to enforce any order or discipline at all. Therefore I humbly hope that a compromise such as I have suggested will be considered.

The Bishop of Chichester: I have only two points to mention, and I think one minute will suffice for each. I ought to say a few words of explanation with regard to what the Bishop of Chelmsford said just now. In the first place he approved of Section 4 of the Measure because he feels it would restrain the danger of individual eccentricity on the part of several bishops. The clause provides that the House of Bishops or the Convocations of Canterbury and York may from time to time issue uch supplementary forms of service as they may consider necessary. I have already informed the other Members

in Charge, and I think they agree with me, that that is too drastic a regulation. It would leave us in this position—that even if a sudden emergency arose, an individual bishop could not act in any way at all with regard to licensing an extra service without a meeting of Convocation, or at least a meeting of the House of Bishops. I hope that an amendment will be brought forward, and in fact I propose if necessary to bring it forward myself in the House of Bishops if it is not proposed in one of the other Houses, by which a bishop should be able to allow the use of a special form of service, unless and until it is prohibited by the whole body of bishops. Control should be retained, and I am glad that the Bishop of Chelmsford expressed his appreciation of that point. I want to retain control by the whole body of bishops over the eccentricities of one; but I think that in an emergency a bishop in his own diocese must be allowed to act for himself.

THE BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD: It would meet my point.

THE BISHOP OF CHICHESTER: The other matter upon which I wish to speak is the question of the position of the Committee. From what the Bishop of Chelmsford said, those who have not read the Report of the Prayer Book Revision Committee very carefully might gather that the Committee of the National Assembly had not been at all in favour of the laity having any share in determining what should be done in any individual parish church. That was not the view of the Committee. They sent up a Resolution which I will not trouble you by reading the whole of, saying that, inasmuch as it is desirable that changes should not be made without the goodwill of the people as represented by the Parochial Church Council, any question which might arise on that should stand referred to the bishop of the diocese. The Committee thought it better not to put that in the Schedule of the Measure. They put it as a separate Resolution for the National Assembly. When it came before the Assembly, its consideration was adjourned because it was a matter connected with the Parochial Church Councils (Further Powers) Measure, and the National Assembly thought that it would be inexpedient to discuss it as a separate Resolution connected with Prayer Book Revision. It must not be thought that the Committee do not agree with the Bishop of Chelmsford that the laity ought to be consulted before changes are introduced.

THE CHAIRMAN: My Lords,—I do not think that anyone in the House of Bishops, or anyone who has listened to the debate or who reads hereafter the report of what has been said, could underrate its importance.

We have had the great gain of a sitting of northern and southern bishops together, and an opportunity has been offered to us slower-

witted southerners of enjoying the privilege, which I, at least, have pressed for, of listening to a series of speeches from the hills of the north which none of us is likely early to forget. What should we have done without the speeches that we have heard yesterday and to-day from the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of Durham, the Bishop of Ripon, the Bishop of Manchester, and the Bishop of Liverpool? We southerners have much to be thankful for in their contributions to the debate, and I feel it to the full. Very much light has been thrown upon the whole subject. I am certain that those who give their minds to it after this debate will feel that the question has been put before them in a more concentrated, possibly more varied, way than it has ever been put before. In view of the discussion which must inevitably follow hereafter, I think that I have been justified in allowing a wide liberty to the speakers to state with such fulness as they have thought right the proposals which they themselves would desire to advocate on the Revision Stage which impends. Bishop after bishop has shown why he supports the Measure, and he has shown too with what reservation or with what openness of mind he will record his vote, if he does record it, in favour of General Approval to-day.

We have had very various suggestions and opinions put before us One bishop, and one only, I think (the Bishop of Norwich), has told us that he is against giving General Approval. If he has succeeded -I cannot tell - in winning to his side the opinion of the majority of your Lordships, then the discussion is at an end, not only in this House, but in the other Houses also. All that can happen is that after a year has passed we may begin again to debate the whole matter in the several Houses, ultimately coming to the stage that we have reached to-day. That, I think, is not a desirable process, and I a little wonder what would be the outcome if we followed that course.

We had a very important proposal adumbrated by the Bishop of Durham, and I think supported by the Bishop of Chelmsford. The Bishop of Durham said that he would give a vote in favour of General Approval with the intention of trying to get the controversial parts of the Measure postponed until after we have got revision of our system of Ecclesiastical Courts. Now I need not tell your Lordships, because you know it well, that no one has been more anxious than I have on the subject of revision of Ecclesiastical Courts. During the forty years that I have been in Convocation we have never had a discussion on the subject in which I have not pressed the point of the desirableness of that step, with which I entirely agree. But I think that we should be living in a fools' paradise indeed if we imagined that even if we could get a reformed system of Ecclesiastical Courts within twenty-four hours we should get out of our difficulties. I should say that that is the best way in which to get out of them.

But may I point out that, if the procedure thus suggested were

followed, the practical difficulties would be of a very strange kind. We should quickly, I suppose, get the uncontroversial parts of the Measure through the three Houses, and it would then become an alternative Prayer Book. After that had been sold in thousands, we should have another alternative Prayer Book containing those parts which had been omitted from the first. I shudder already at the thought of the amount of literature which will be in the hands of churchgoers who wish to be fully armed with the revised Lectionary, Prayer Book, and Psalter. It is a prosaic point, but it is a practical point, I think, and one which has hardly been adequately weighed, because, of course, we are dealing with far deeper and higher matters than that.

Then we had the Bishop of Liverpool, who would like the whole of those parts of the Measure which deal with the Holy Communion omitted, that office being left untouched. We had the suggestion of the Archbishop of York, supported more or less by the Bishop of Winchester, that the Prayer Book, with the Holy Communion Office of 1549, should be adopted in lieu of the proposal of the Measure.

Then the Bishop of Ely, in opinion though not in intent, is against an alternative Book altogether. There is no one of all the bishops more entitled than he to express an independent judgment on the matter. He has studied the subject from the beginning, and has wielded a labouring oar right through. He speaks of the danger of the alluring principle of alternatives, and I gave full attention to what he said, but I confess that I do not myself quite see, nor, I think, does he see, how at this stage we could change front to the extent involved without sacrificing a great deal of what we have done in the past. All who have indicated a course have shown cause, and weightily shown it, for what they have suggested. My own desire is to rest exactly upon and adhere to the principle and purposes of the motion that we should give General Approval to the Measure. What for? In order that by passing the motion (and it can only be done by passing it) we may give an opportunity to the several Houses to suggest such changes as they think necessary in proposals which in a large sense we feel to be proposals which ought to be before the Church. Unless we pass that motion, there will be no opportunity for the House of Clergy, the House of Laity or the House of Bishops, for some time to come, to propose any modification of what is now before us. We should have to begin the whole matter afresh, and I, for one, should regret that beyond words. What I want is that there should be discussion on the various amendments that may arise in the places to which it will go.

Whatever else we have done by this debate we have made it clear that the bishops are not endeavouring in any high-handed way to force down the throats, so to speak, of other members of the Assembly a definite cut-and-dried proposal of their own on

which they are all agreed. It has been shown that the bishops are not agreed, and that they, like others, have an open mind with regard to suggested changes which may be made. Some of them have already advocated changes, and that very fact shows how perfectly ready the House of Bishops is to listen to and consider and weigh, when the proper time comes, the suggestions which will, as I hope, come from the different Houses as to changes which they may think desirable in the proposals which are before us.

My Lords, to-day is a solemn day of responsibility for us bishops in giving General Approval to this Measure. Such days send us to our knees. We have shown, I think, in our debate that we see and weigh the difficulties which to many easy outside critics seem to be either negligible or easy to solve. We trust—I, at least, trust—that these difficulties are going to be faced and handled by those on whom the responsibility of handling them in the different Houses rests. They will do it, I hope and believe, temperately and wisely. This debate was intended to help, and when published it will, I think, help, the Houses to give suggestions for discussion, and perhaps guidance as to the conclusion to which they will come. With us, as the House of Bishops, rests, my Lords, as we know, the ultimate responsibility for the form in which the Assembly will finally be asked, before the final sanction of Convocation is given, to say Yes or No to the proposals put before them. Ours is the ultimate responsibility, and so it ought to be. What else are we here for but to accept ultimate responsibility in matters of this kind?

But it is not a light thing. Brethren, pray for us. We want this whole matter raised to the level of the simple thought. How can we best, under the guidance of God the Holy Spirit, make the public worship in our Church a worthy thing? We long to secure, and we have striven to-day to secure, that those who bear the trust of membership in our Assemblies, clerical and lay, shall be able with intelligence and knowledge to strive with us for the faith of the Gospel, and make that faith a living, growing reality as expressed in the order of prayers and praises of the Church which it is our privilege to serve. That is what is before us now, and may God guide us in the step which we are about to take.

Now may I put the Resolution moved by the Bishop of Chichester, and seconded by the Bishop of Truro:

> "That the Measure entitled 'The Revised Prayer Book (Permissive Use) Measure, 1923,' be generally approved."

The motion was carried with three dissentients.

Revised Psalter (Permissive Use) Measure, 1923.

The Bishop of Ely moved :—

"That the Measure entitled 'The Revised Psalter (Permissive Use) Measure' be generally approved."

There are two matters (he said) to which I wish to call attention at the beginning. The first is the question of the omissions suggested in Part I. of the Schedule to the Measure, which the Bishop of Chichester has already mentioned in his speech. As to this, I will only say that there is all the difference in the world between reading words of Scripture forming part of an historical narrative which we listen to, and the devotional recitation of words of Scripture which as far as possible we make our own. I should, of course, resist with all my might any omissions in the reading of Scripture in the one case, but on the other hand it seems to me that our Lord Himself gives us good reason for omitting words when we devotionally repeat the words of the Psalter, and try as far as we can to make them our own.

The second part of the Schedule deals with the revision of the language of the Psalter. This matter started so long ago as May, 1909, in the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury, when the following Resolution was passed :—

"That while the Prayer Book Version of the Psalms cannot wisely be revised as a whole, it is advisable that some passages should be re-translated."

The Lower House then appointed a Committee, and after a time that Committee made a Report in which it gave a Revised Version of the Prayer Book Psalter, Psalms 1 to 41. Then in April, 1912, the Lower House passed a Resolution requesting your Grace—

"To take steps to secure an authoritative Revision of the Psalter for use in the Public Services of the Church."

We must therefore allow full credit to the Lower House of Convocation for starting this very important work.

On the 2nd July, 1913, I proposed in the Upper House the following Resolution :-

"That this House, having in view the Resolution passed by the Lower House of Convocation on April 30, 1912, requests his Grace the President to take such steps as may seem to him advisable in order to secure the revision of passages in the Psalter in which the language is specially obscure or misleading."

In laying the Resolution before the House, I said that it seemed to me a leading principle that the Psalter was an English devotional and liturgical classic, and that therefore there was no reason for a revision which would aim at closer translation from the Hebrew, in which mistakes in translation as such would be corrected. At the same time there were obviously passages, not very numerous, in which the language was very obscure, and which in fact were little removed from pure nonsense; and certain other passages which were unnecessarily misleading and difficult for a congregation intelligently to recite in church. I added that in my judgment such passages needed revision. I said that the revision must be on strictly conservative lines: that no doubt reference would be made to the Hebrew when any emendation by reason of obscurity was taking place; but that the aim would not be to make the Prayer Book Psalter an exact translation of the Hebrew. I further said that special pains ought to be taken to maintain the dignity and the rhythm of the English.

The Resolution was seconded by the then Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Gore, who emphatically said that what he desired was an intensely conservative revision; and your Grace, before putting the Resolution to the House, emphasised once more the fact that the Resolution was a request for a revision of the Prayer Book Psalter as an English classical book of devotion. You added "That is a view of the English Psalter which it is extremely desirable the public should realise as the true view."

Your Grace then, in consulation with the Archbishop of York, appointed a Committee to deal with the revision. The members of the Committee were the Bishop of Chester (Dr. Jayne), who was Chairman, the Bishop of Ely (myself), the Dean of Ely (Dr. Kirkpatrick), the Dean of Norwich (Dr. Beeching), the Dean of Wells (Dr. Armitage Robinson), Dr. A. C. Benson (Master of Magdalene), and Dr. J. W. Mackail, with Dr. Nairne, who was then Professor of Hebrew at King's College, London, as the Secretary. It goes without saying that on all matters connected with the Hebrew we looked for guidance to Dr. Kirkpatrick and Dr. Nairne; and as to the very important problems of English, whether English idiom or English vocabulary, we had the great advantage of having with us Dr. Benson, Dr. Mackail, and Dr. Beeching.

This Committee reported in 1916, having been engaged on the work for about three years. The following words in the Report are noteworthy:—

> "Bearing our instructions in mind, we have conducted our revision on strictly conservative lines. We have proposed no change in the text which did not present itself to us as necessary towards intelligent devotional use of the verse or passage in question."

In July, 1917, the Archbishop brought the Report of this Committee before the Upper House of Convocation, and that House

appointed the then Bishop of Gloucester (Dr. Gibson) and the then Bishop of Truro (Dr. Burrows) to consider it, and to advise the House. They reported in February of the next year, 1918, deprecating some of the emendations made by the original Committee, and suggesting some emendations of their own. To the Report of these two bishops the House gave its general approval.

Then some little time elapsed, and your Grace brought the recommendations of the original Committee, and of the Committee of the two bishops before a third body, which we generally knew as the Drafting Committee. It was a Committee which had been appointed to put into final shape the alterations proposed by Convocation in the Book of Common Prayer, and it was drawn both from the Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation. This Drafting Committee reviewed the work of the two previous Committees, and made certain suggestions of their own. That was the third stage.

The fourth and final stage was the appointment by the National Assembly of a small Committee before whom there lay the three Reports of the three preceding Committees. This Committee once again went carefully over the whole Psalter, and its Report is the basis of the Measure which is now before us.

I think it has been worth while, my Lords, to spend a few minutes upon the history of this revision. It shows us how many minds have been at work, and carefully at work, on the task.

Now a few words, if you will permit me to add them, about the revision itself. First of all, great pains were taken at every stage to ensure that the character of the English was consistent, and appropriate to the whole context of Coverdale's work. We tried to express an emendation in the very words, if possible, which Coverdale had used in other places in the Psalter, and when that could not be, we took care as far as possible that the words or the verse introduced should be harmonious with the English of Coverdale's time.

Two types of revision were possible. On the one hand, of course, many people desire a version for public worship as close to the Hebrew as possible. But such fidelity must be absolutely thorough, else at once the work of the reviser is open to the charge of slipshod and careless scholarship. Under such conditions as that the changes must be innumerable, and I am quite certain that under the constraining pressure of scholarship Coverdale's version would very rapidly be rooted up. A version of the Hebrew Psalms made with all the equipment of modern scholarship, a version as close as possible to the Hebrew original, would, I think, be an inestimable boon to all students of the Bible; but I venture to say that it must be independent of the trammels of any previous version, and it must be a version for private study. On the other hand, many people set the very highest possible value on Coverdale's Psalter, both as an English literary work of the noblest

character, and also as a book of devotion consecrated by innumerable tender associations. Such persons desire a revision of Coverdale's Psalter in which serious obscurities are removed—such, in fact, as was suggested in the terms of reference given by Convocation to the original Committee. I myself cannot doubt for a moment that whether we look at the question from a literary, from a liturgical, or from a devotional point of view, the latter is the right conception, and that that conception answers to the main drift of opinion in the Church.

Perhaps someone will say, "You laid it down just now that it was not part of the aim in this work of revision to correct mistranslations, however gross, and yet you sometimes appear to have done so." My answer is that it was impossible to keep with absolute rigidity within the exact lines laid down. Sometimes it may seem that corrections of translation are given where there is no very startling obscurity in the English. You cannot be quite consistent in such a matter; you cannot lay down quite rigid rules.

For myself I do not think that the revision before us is a perfect revision. I do not know that there remains any seriously obscure or misleading passage that has not been, as I hope, satisfactorily revised; but on the other hand I confess that according to my very conservative standard some passages have been altered which, in my judgment, would have been far better if left as they were. But then I am keenly conscious that others, whose opinions I heartily respect, would have gone further in the direction of emendation than I myself should have done. No revision which the wit of man could produce would please everybody. If, which God forbid, this revision were rejected, I should say, "This is a sad and conspicuous instance of the best, the unattainable best, being the enemy of the essentially good." If, on the other hand, as I most earnestly hope, this revision on which so much pains has been spent is accepted and authorised, then I think you will agree with me that it will carry a little nearer to perfection, and remove real blemishes from, a great work of a great man to whom English Christianity owes an incalculable debt for his work on the Bible: and also will confer a very real and much needed benefit on those who worship in the churches of the Church of England.

I move therefore the General Approval of the Revised Psalter (Permissive Use) Measure.

The Bishop of Chester: Your Grace,—I think that there must have been a touch of irony in the Bishop of Ely's request when he asked me to second the Resolution. There were two things in his mind, I think. First of all, he no doubt wished if possible that a northern bishop should second it, and he kindly thought of me as perhaps, as Bishop of Chester, in some sense filling the place with Bishop Jayne held when he sat as Chairman of the first Committee; secondly, there is one class of person which has occupied ever since the days of the

Apostles a position of honour and consideration in the Church, I mean those who have in successive generations filled the *rôle* of the unlearned. Now, as one of the unlearned, I very heartily indeed support the motion for General Approval of the Measure.

Of course at once prejudice arises against the revision of the Psalter, and on many grounds. First, it is a part of Holy Scripture with which we are all most familiar. But I think that it is far better that we, who are accustomed to the use of the old words, should accept an alteration than that the men who follow us, whether as clergy or as laymen, should be deprived of an intelligible edition of the Psalter. Then there is the question of the extraordinary beauty of Coverdale's version. Lord Granville used to say that the most magnificent bit in the whole of English literature was the Preface to the Communion Service: "Therefore, with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name." Many of us would perhaps turn rather to the Psalter for our favourite passage. Take, for instance, those beautiful words: "He rode upon the cherubims, and did fly: he came flying upon the wings of the wind. He made darkness his secret place: his pavilion round about him with dark water, and thick clouds to cover him." No one with any sense whatever of the exquisite could fail to see the extraordinary beauty of such a passage.

Thirdly, there is the wonderful delicacy of Coverdale's English. There are things which are easy enough to paraphrase, but here it is not so. I can well understand that people who would not object to revision of other parts of the Bible might say, "Keep your hands off a piece of English of extraordinary beauty like the Psalter." On the other hand it must be admitted that we meet with defects in Coverdale's version, which I cannot help feeling it will be a gain to remove. He is sometimes not only obscure, but absolutely unintelligible. Unintelligibility is somewhat irritating, and I think that it is really dangerous. I do not think it is reverent towards God, or good for ourselves, that we should say or sing things which really and truly have no meaning.

I think that I have said enough in defence of the extraordinarily beautiful and moderate revision of the Psalter, the adoption of which the Bishop of Ely has proposed. I am certain that we shall all be extremely thankful for the essential aid which the Committee sought from people like Dr. Benson and Dr. Mackail, and from the Dean of Norwich, Dr. Beeching. I am perfectly certain that anyone who takes these proposals in his hands, and goes through them quietly and steadily one by one, will be almost delighted on the one hand with the extraordinary way in which alteration has been avoided where alteration was unnecessary, and on the other hand by the value that has been added by making passages more intelligible, or, it may be, more striking, than they were before.

The Bishop of Ely, in proposing the motion, said that it would be a very good thing if someone would make a translation really according to the Hebrew. He knows, as I know, how Dr. Driver did that, and produced a book of great usefulness and value—the parallel Psalter. It is a delightful book to use; but when you look at the translation of the Hebrew, I am certain that you would say that it would be impossible to use it in public worship, and no one, I think, could attempt a more hopeless task than setting it to music.

With a certain measure of confidence, my Lords, for the reasons that I have given, I ask you, if you will, to accept the motion for General Approval of the Measure.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will now put the Resolution to the House. But before doing so I would like to say how entirely I concur in the tribute which has been paid by both the speakers to the help from outside which has been given in this matter, and we do not forget the help that has been given by those not specially mentioned to-day. The fact that the task has been attempted, both officially and unofficially, by men so different in their characteristics is in itself an enormous gain. I for one owe a great deal to Sir Edward Clarke for the time and labour that he has given to the subject, and the amount of fresh light which he has brought to bear on the translation of the Psalter. To those who have given labours of love we are very grateful, and we thank them for the contribution that they have added. I entirely agree with what the Bishop of Ely said as to the Psalter being an English devotional book, and not merely a translation of the Hebrew. I feel, my Lords, that we should be unworthy of that which has come down to us through the centuries if we did not show our appreciation of what is put before us, and I am sure that we shall all be prepared to give General Approval to the Measure, leaving the details to be dealt with afterwards.

The motion was put, and agreed to.

The Session closed at 4.45 *p.m.*

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall.